# REPORT RESUMES

ED 013 252

TE 000 005

THE 1965 INSTITUTES IN ENGLISH, REPORT OF A PILOT STUDY TO DEVELOP CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING NDEA INSTITUTES IN ENGLISH.
BY- GRAY, DONALD, J.
MODERN LANGUAGE ASSN. OF AMERICA, NEW YORK, N.Y.
NATIONAL COUNCIL OF TEACHERS OF ENGLISH

PUB DATE APR 66
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.50 HC-$4.16 104P.

DESCRIPTORS- *ENGLISH INSTRUCTION, *EVALUATION METHODS, *INSTITUTES (TRAINING PROGRAMS), *PILOT PROJECTS, *PROGRAM EVALUATION, FEDERAL PROGRAMS, INSERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION, TEACHING METHODS, NATIONAL COUNCIL OF TEACHERS OF ENGLISH, NDEA SUMMER INSTITUTES IN ENGLISH, MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

THE DUAL PURPOSES OF THIS 1965 PILOT STUDY OF THE 103 NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT SUMMER INSTITUTES IN ENGLISH WERE TO DRAW CONCLUSIONS ABOUT HOW A STUDY OF INSTITUTES COULD BEST BE CONDUCTED AND WHAT OUGHT TO BE THE PURPOSES OF SUCH A STUDY, AND TO REPORT ON WHAT THE INSTITUTES ACCOMPLISHED, TENTATIVELY EVALUATING THEIR EFFECTIVENESS. THE PRIMARY DATA WERE COLLECTED THROUGH QUESTIONNAIRES SENT TO THE PARTICIPANTS AND STAFFS OF THE INSTITUTES, AND 3 TO 5-DAY VISITATIONS CONDUCTED AT NINE OF THEM. RECOGNIZING THE INHERENT LIMITATIONS OF SUCH AN ANALYSIS, THE PILOT STUDY DID INDICATE THAT MOST TEACHERS STUDIED MATERIAL THEY COULD PUT TO IMMEDIATE USE IN THEIR CLASSROOMS, AND THAT THE MATERIAL WAS IN SOME WAY APPROPRIATE TO THEIR PECULIAR SHORTCOMINGS, NEEDS, AND RESPONSIBILITIES. THE PROBLEMS OF THE INSTITUTES WERE GENERALLY THE OUTGROWTH OF THEIR UNIQUE NATURE--SHORT, UNIFIED SUMMER COURSES IN SUBJECTS TAUGHT TO STUDENTS WHO ARE TEACHERS THEMSELVES. FUTURE STUDIES SHOULD NOT ATTEMPT TO JUDGE INSTITUTES, BUT RATHER TO DESCRIBE THEM, COMMUNICATING TO NON-PARTICIPANT TEACHERS AND INSTITUTE DIRECTORS WHAT IS NEW AND EFFECTIVE IN THE INSTITUTES AND THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH. THE INFORMATION NECESSARY FOR SUCH A REPORT COULD BE GATHERED BEST BY (1) QUESTIONNAIRES WHICH PROBE NOT ONLY SUPERFICIAL OPINIONS ABOUT THE INSTITUTES BUT ALSO THE MOTIVES AND EXPECTATIONS OF PARTICIPANTS, (2) FOLLOW UP STUDIES ON PARTICIPANTS, AND (3) INTENSIVE INTERVIEW VISITS TO INSTITUTES BY TEAMS COMPOSED OF A TEACHER OF ENGLISH AND A KNOWLEDGEABLE PERSON WHO IS NOT A TEACHER HIMSELF. (DL)

ED013252

# The 1965 Institutes in English

Report of a pilot study to develop criteria for evaluating NDEA Institutes in English

## by Donald J. Gray

THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA
and
THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF TEACHERS OF ENGLISH

TE 000 005

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

# THE 1965 NDEA INSTITUTES IN ENGLISH

## REPORT OF A PILOT STUDY TO DEVELOP CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING NDEA INSTITUTES IN ENGLISH

by Donald J. Gray

The evaluation reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

The Modern Language Association of America

and

The National Council of Teachers of English

April 1966

TE 000 005

Copies of this publication may be obtained from the Materials Center, Modern Language Association, 4 Washington Place, New York, N. Y. 10003 [after July 1967, 60 Fifth Avenue, New York, New York, 10011], and from the National Council of Teachers of English, 508 South Sixth Street, Champaign, Illinois 61820.

Price: $1.00 each; 20% discount on orders of 20 or more, sent to one address.

## CONTENTS

page

Introduction .................................................. 1

The Data of the Study ......................................... 3

i. The Means of the Study ..................................... 3

ii. The Defects of the Means .................................. 5

Conclusions of the Pilot Study ................................ 9

The Institutes: Summary ....................................... 18

The Pilot Study: Summary and Prospectus ....................... 25

Notes ......................................................... 29

Appendices:

Appendix A: Tabulations of responses to the questionnaires ................................. 30

Appendix B: Tables of relationships between responses to items on the questionnaires ............... 58

Appendix C: Comments about the institutes by participants and members of the staffs .................... 75

Appendix D: The evaluators' checklist .................... 86

Appendix E: The use of new materials in the institutes ... 98

# INTRODUCTION

During the summer of 1965, institutes for elementary and secondary school teachers of English were for the first time supported by money made available through provisions of the National Defense Education Act. One hundred and three institutes in English were taught; five and one half million dollars was awarded for the teaching of them; 4400 elementary and secondary school teachers attended them; and over five hundred college and high school teachers taught in them. The problem these institutes were designed to address and to begin to resolve surely needs little description here. In the past decade many essays and studies -- most notably _The National Interest and the Teaching of English_, published by the National Council of Teachers of English in 1961 -- have assumed or demonstrated that the teaching of English in elementary and secondary schools is not as effective as it should be because its teachers are not thoroughly or recently educated to teach their subject. Nor was it an untried idea to educate teachers in summer institutes. The NDEA institutes of 1965 drew heavily on the carefully planned institutes in English taught in the summer of 1962 and organized by the Commission on English of the College Entrance Examination Board.[1]

But the institutes of 1965 were more numerous, more various in their plans, and in consequence presumably more broad in their effects and promises, than previous institutes. Late in the spring of 1965, therefore, the Modern Language Association was commissioned by the U. S. Office of Education to conduct a study designed to measure some of the profits, and to describe some of the possibilities, of the unprecedented investment of money, time, and energy in institutes for elementary and secondary school teachers of English. The committee[2] which planned the study conceived of it as exploratory and experimental. Its fundamental purpose was not to describe how well institutes were taught in the summer of 1965. Its purpose was rather to discover how to find out what was happening in institutes and how to evaluate their effectiveness. Its question fundamentally was not "How good were the institutes?" or even "What did they do?" Its question was rather, "How can a study of institutes be conducted, and what ought to be the purpose of such a study?"

The planning committee chose to employ two primary means of collecting information and opinions: a questionnaire which was to be completed by the participants, and another by the staff, in all 103 institutes; and a series of three to five day visits to nine of the institutes by evaluators who would write reports to be used by the director of the study. Because many of the institutes in English taught in the summer of 1965 were modeled on those taught three years earlier in the program administered by the Commission on English, most of the nine institutes chosen to be visited were unlike the 1962 institutes in their organization and purposes. This schedule of visits was later enlarged to include three additional institutes whose plans suggested that several kinds of educational media would or could profitably be used in them. The directors of these institutes (and of one of the original nine institutes) were asked to receive two visitors at the same time, one of them to be someone who was also visiting other institutes to prepare a report for the director of this study, and the other to be named by Dean James Brown of San Jose State College, the director of a project to evaluate NDEA institutes in educational media.

Late in June and again in September the members of the planning committee met with the director and associate director of the study, the visitors to the institutes, and a group of writers, editors, educators, and businessmen and women to discuss the means and ends of the study.[3] The principal business of the meeting in June was to decide the questions to be asked of the participants and staff by the visitors to the institutes; the purpose of the meeting in September was to review the visitors' reports and the tabulations of responses to the questionnaires. The most interesting matter of both meetings, however, was evoked by the presence of Miss Gibson, Mrs. Browne-Mayers,Mr. Larrabee, Dr. Frank Slaughter, Mr. Snodgrass, Mr. Street, Mr. Carroll, Mr. Shallenberger, and Mr. Jovanovich. Each these persons exercises a central interest in language and education in ways and from perspectives different from those of the college teachers present, whose experience or responsibilities in departments of English, academic societies, or government agencies have encouraged them to think of institutes as a natural response to a self-evident difficulty. Their remarks therefore recurrently proposed or required the recognition of certain fundamental questions: What are institutes? How does their instruction differ from that which colleges and universities offer to prepare their students to teach English? Are institutes intended simply to repair deficiences permitted by inadequate means of educating and certifying teachers, or is some form of in-service and post-baccalaureate education not only useful but necessary even for well-prepared teachers?

Neither in the questionnaires nor in the evaluators' reports were these questions explicitly asked or answered. But they have undoubtedly colored the questions which were asked of the people who attended or taught in institutes, and they have undoubtedly helped to shape the judgments of the visitors who reported on the institutes. And these large questions about the nature, necessity, consequences, and permanence of the kind of education attempted in the institutes stand behind this study and serve to define the ground the study began to measure. This report describes how and what the members of the committee learned of the activities and effectiveness of the NDEA institutes taught in 1965. It suggests how more might be learned about institutes taught in the future. But the point of learning what has happened ought not to be simply to record and judge it. The most interesting effect of institutes is that their successes alter the character and urgency of the problem they exist to meet. Institutes, therefore, ought to change. Reports on institutes ought to encourage and help to direct this change, not only in institutes but also in the established ways of educating teachers in undergraduate and graduate curricula. This report looks back at some of the NDEA institutes taught in the summer of 1965. But one of its conclusions is that future reports ought to look back only to look ahead, ought to provide information about all that happened in last summer's institutes only to suggest how teachers might usefully be taught next summer, or all year round in the courses in which they enroll before they become teachers. A report on institutes is, or ought to be, fundamentally a report on changes that have not yet happened. Even this study does not always keep it in view, one of the ideas with which it began is that the purpose of institutes, and of reports on them, is to discover each year afresh which changes ought to take place and then to help make them happen.

## THE DATA OF THE STUDY

The principal sources of the data of the Pilot Study were the responses to the participants' and director-staff questionnaires, and the reports of the visitors to the institutes. These sources were supplemented by the reports of Professor Martha Cox of the Department of English of San Jose State College, who observed four institutes in English in order to evaluate the uses of educational media in the institutes in English.[4] The director of the Pilot Study also received and read copies of the original proposals and final reports submitted by the directors of the nine institutes visited. In addition, about thirty directors responded to a request to write to the director of the Pilot Study and offer their judgments of the institute they had conducted, the idea of institutes in general, and the means used by the Pilot Study to learn about and evaluate the institutes of 1965.

Because these latter sources of data were supplemental, they will not be discussed in this part of the report, in which, first, the principal means used to collect the data of the Pilot Study will be described, and then the defects of these principal means suggested. In the next part of the report, in which some conclusions will be drawn from the data collected, the reports and remarks of the directors of the institutes are sometimes useful to confirm or qualify the information and opinions gathered by the questionnaires and put forward by the evaluators.

### i. The Means of the Study

#### The Questionnaires

The questionnaires which were sent to the participants, directors and members of the staffs in all the institutes were written by Professor Craig Swauger, the associate director of the Pilot Study. It was necessary to design the questionnaires so that the responses could be quickly tabulated by machine. At the same time, members of the committee wanted to include questions about every factor which might affect the quality and effectiveness of the institutes, so that as much as possible could be learned about the kinds and forms of questions which elicit useful information, as well as about what happened in the institutes, and where, how, and why they succeeded or failed. Professor Swauger was asked, therefore, to design questionnaires which were as broad and full as they could practically be. He had only about three weeks in which to write them. Then he was required to wait another month, until near the end of July, until the questionnaires were finally approved by all the necessary government agencies and he was permitted to print and mail them to the directors of the institutes. It was necessary to send mimeographed forms of the questionnaires to the directors of some institutes whose terms ended in July. Printed copies were sent to all the other institutes early in August, during the extraordinarily busy final weeks of their terms.

Despite the tardiness and bulk of the questionnaires, over 98% of those who received them -- 4185 participants and 490 staff members in 102 institutes -- completed and returned them. The data so collected was treated in three ways. First, the responses of the participants in all the institutes were summarized in one tabulation, and those of the members of the staffs of all the institutes were summarized in another (Appendix A). Separate compilations were also made of the responses of the participants and members of the staffs in each of the institutes visited. Second, the responses to certain questions were analyzed by categories derived from the responses to other questions. For example, the responses of all participants to Item 73 ("Check the one teaching problem that most vexed you as a teacher before enrolling in the Institute") were organized according to the grades in which the participants taught, the number of years they had given to teaching, the number of graduate credits they had earned, their ages, etc. (Appendix B). Finally, the associate director read, excerpted, and classified the opinions written by those participants and members of the staffs -- perhaps half the number who completed a questionnaire -- who accepted the invitation on its final page to comment on how the institute had helped them to help improve the teaching of English, and how future institutes can best serve teachers of English (Appendix C).

## The Visits

It was originally planned to visit only nine of the 103 institutes taught in the summer of 1965. Four of these institutes (those at the Universities of Washington, Nevada, and Nebraska, and one of two taught at Boston University) were general institutes whose curricula were modeled on that taught in 1962, but only one (that at Boston) followed the pattern of 1962 and restricted its enrollment to secondary school teachers. The other five were special institutes: another institute at Boston University in literature, one at Chicago Teachers College North and another at Michigan State University in applied linguistics, one at Claflin College in South Carolina in advanced composition and linguistics, and one at the University of Chicago for secondary school teachers of English to culturally deprived students. Four of these latter institutes were restricted to secondary school teachers. Three of the nine institutes required participants to have earned a bachelor's degree with a major in English; two required a bachelor's degree but no more than a minor in English; and the other four, each of which enrolled elementary as well as secondary school teachers, required at least a bachelor's degree but did not require of all participants that they have completed a major in English. The number of participants in these nine institutes ranged from thirty to two hundred; the usual number, as it was for all the institutes, was between thirty and fifty. Their terms were from three weeks to eight weeks.

Each of these institutes was visited by an evaluator who remained on the campus three to five days -- visiting classes, talking to participants and instructors, seeking out members of the institution and the department of English not directly involved in the institute, and finally writing his report. Three of the evaluators visited two institutes; three visited only one. Each visitor was given a list of topics his report might usefully discuss and of questions it might usefully answer (Appendix D). All the reports were submitted in the form of a series of answers to those questions on the check list which were relevant to the institute. In addition, most evaluators submitted a narrative report epitomizing the activities of the institutes they visited, summarizing their judgments of them, and speculating about the effects and promises of institutes in general.

Just before the visits began, three additional institutes were added to the schedule: the institute at the University of Puerto Rico for teachers of English to culturally deprived students, that of the Breadloaf School at Middlebury College in dramatic arts and literature, and that at George Peabody College in language and composition. All these additional institutes enrolled forty to fifty secondary school teachers. Each was selected because its plan suggested that profitable use could or would be made of various kinds of educational media. Professor Martha Cox visited all three of these institutes and the institute at

Chicago Teachers College North. She was accompanied on each visit by a different evaluator in the Pilot Study, who remained at the institute for two days. The reports of these visits were submitted to Dean James Brown, the director of the study of the NDEA institutes in educational media.

## ii. The Defects of the Means

### Redundant and Profitless Questions

The most evident, and least damaging, deficiency of the questionnaires and visitors' checklists was the presence in them of questions which contributed more to their bulk than to the useful information collected. Some of these questions were unnecessary. For example, everyone who attended or taught in an institute was required to record its classification, type, length, and size on the questionnaire (Items 1-5 on participant's and director-staff questionnaires). This information is, or can be, useful when placed together with other information -- to discover, say, the relationship between the length of an institute and opinions about its work load. But the information can be acquired more economically by coding the questionnaires so that the institute from which each is returned can be easily learned. Similarly it is unnecessary to ask everyone in an institute whether it has a separate library (Items 60 and 49). Nor does it now seem useful to require visitors to ask how many participants withdrew (very few did), how many tests were administered (very few), who chose the staff (the director), and who chose the director (again, usually the director, by the act of suggesting that his institution conduct an institute). If this information is instructive, it can be obtained from the proposals and final reports of the institute directors.

Some other items on the questionnaire turned out to be profitless not because they were unnecessary, but because they were so written that they elicited unilluminating answers to potentially useful questions. It would be interesting to know, for example, the kinds of instructional material participants found most useful in the workshops, and it seems possible to acquire this information on a questionnaire. But when one-third of the respondents check "None of above" on a list of instructional devices and material (Item 46), it is clear that the list ought to have been more cunningly inclusive. So too the participants' responses to Item 47 -- in which they were asked to describe the activities of the workshop as "Introductory to long-range benefits," "Of immediate benefit," and "Combination of the two above" -- tended to cluster around the last, most vague, and least informative of these phrases, none of which was properly concrete in its suggestion of the benefits the workshops might confer.

### Tendentiousness

Some other questions were so phrased that they drew responses which cannot be wholly trusted. Sometimes this fault lay in the question, as when on both the questionnaires the participants and members of the institute staff were informed before they answered the question that "The use of a variety of films was intended to be a significant phase of the Institute" (Items 63-65, 52-54). Given this preface, the high esteem in which the participants professed to hold the films would seem to say more about their loyalty to the institute than it does about the films. The opening sentence to the question about the benefits of living, eating, and working with other teachers for a summer (Item 70) also seems to campaign for a favorable response. In other items the fault lay not in the question but in the responses available on the questionnaire. Certainly the choice in Item 75 of the participants' questionnaire between describing the institute as "Exhilerating throughout" and "Occasionally stimulating" forced some participants to claim an excitement larger than they received, and may even have required scrupulous participants to settle for a description which was less approving than the one they would have devised for themselves.

More generally, the entire set of the Pilot Study, as it seemed to be betrayed in the topics and emphases about which its questionnaires and evaluators were curious, lies under a charge of tendentiousness brought by many institute directors in their letters to the director and associate director of the Pilot Study. It is true that the authors of the questionnaires did assume, what was a fact, that most NDEA institutes in the summer of 1965 were organized like the CEEB institutes taught in the summer of 1962. It was difficult, therefore, for directors and participants satisfactorily to describe an institute which varied from this pattern on questionnaires primarily designed to fit the majority of institutes which followed the pattern. It is also true that the evaluators who visited the institutes brought with them firm ideas about the effective means and ends of institutes. The evaluators were chosen because they had firm ideas, because they did know and were willing to judge ways of educating teachers. But the purpose of the visits and the questionnaires was not to impose patterns and ideas, but to learn about them. The purpose of the Pilot Study is not to measure institutes against a single pattern, or to manufacture a model pattern from those attempted in 1965, but to learn how to discover and broadcast the many fruitful possibilities of institutes. The point is worth raising here because it has been frequently raised by directors and participants who saw in the means of the Pilot Study an attempt to legislate as well as to judge and report. Any judgment or report must proceed from an idea of what is useful and what is worth reporting. Any study such as this one is therefore likely to seem tendentious in its means and conclusions, to seem at least as interested in making sure that only certain things happen as it is in finding out what is happening. This report can now only disclaim such intentions. Future studies need to make their own intentions unmistakable by using instruments which are flexible enough both to honor variety and to measure it against the constantly changing necessities and ends to be served by all institutes.

## Superficiality and Partiality

It is more difficult to step free of the superficiality inherent in questionnaires, and of the partiality inescapable in scheduling visits to only about ten of more than a hundred institutes. Questionnaires are more useful for collecting facts than opinions, but they are better even at collecting opinions than they are at digging toward answers to the really interesting questions about institutes -- why people attend and teach in them, what they expect of them, how their expectations and motives change during the course of the institute, what else is changed by it? The "Free Response" section of the questionnaires was intended to afford participants and members of the staffs a chance to escape the rigidity of its form. In this section many people did offer opinions and give names to satisfactions and dissatisfactions which the body of the questionnaire itself did not elicit. But even if it were possible to read carefully the 2000 or so paragraphs written on the "Free Response" sections, ten minutes of prose cannot fully discharge the frustrations built up in an hour of checking machine-scored responses which often do not seem to provide an opportunity to say exactly what the respondent wants to say. Again, this study can only acknowledge that at their best the questionnaires simplified complicated and profound opinion, however efficient they were at collecting large amounts of valuable information and at compiling opinions which in the aggregate are illuminating about important matters.

The visits of the evaluators were intended to make up for these limitations by furnishing reports which went deeply into some matters only superficially surveyed by the questionnaires. On some matters of central importance, as the next section of this report will show, the reports of the visitors did do all that they were intended to do. In two ways, however, the value of the reports of the visitors was limited: first, by the schedule arranged for the evaluators; and, second, by the very nature of such visits.

The schedule of visits did not permit the evaluators to observe institutes taught at each or even at most of the kinds of institutions which conducted institutes during the summer. Only one institute conducted at a teachers' college was fully described in a visitor's report, the large (200 participants), fast (three weeks) institute in applied linguistics taught at Chicago Teachers North. Only one institute taught in a liberal arts college was visited, that offered at Claflin College, a predominantly Negro college in South Carolina, for secondary school teachers who had taken no more than a minor in English. The special intentions and characteristics of these institutes cannot accurately represent those of other institutes conducted on the campuses of similar colleges. Of the seven institutes visited on the campuses of large state or urban universities, only one (the general institute at Boston University) was organized like the CEEB institutes of 1962. Although visitors did return to two institutions (the Universities of Nevada and Washington) which had offered institutes for teachers of English in the summer of 1962, no visitor returned to any of the eight institutes conducted this year by large eastern or midwestern universities which had also conducted a CEEB institute three years ago.

These decisions were determined by a reluctance to rehearse the reports which are the basis of John Gerber's study. However prudent the decisions may have been, given the limited time available to plan the study and the small scale on which it was executed, they do compromise the authority and usefulness of the conclusions which can be drawn from the evaluators' reports. It is not possible to demonstrate or even to speculate upon the differences in tone and effect between institutes conducted on a small campus and in a small town, and institutes conducted in an urban environment and on a large campus busy with the activities and distractions of a full summer session. It is not possible to speculate upon the difference in the changes an institute might help to effect in the curriculum of an institution whose primary function is the preparation of teachers, and in the curriculum of a department of English is a large university which serves many functions, the first of which is not to educate teachers but to investigate and advance the subject they teach. It is possible to use the evaluators' reports, along with other data, to compare the character and possible effects of the institutes of 1962 and 1965, particularly because some of the visitors were very closely engaged in the planning of the CEEB institutes. But these comparisons would have been more surely founded and more consistently instructive if the schedule of visits had permitted the evaluators to observe more institutes like those taught three years earlier and described in Mr. Gerber's report, and to visit several institutes taught in schools which had conducted institutes in 1962 and had perhaps adapted this summer's institute to the lessons of that previous summer.

The limitation consequent upon the very nature of visits also makes it difficult to draw sure conclusions and comparisons -- or, more accurately, it reduces the number of conclusions and comparisons which can be surely drawn. It is not practical to visit all institutes. Any one evaluator can visit only a few institutes, and it is impossible to assume that all evaluators will bring the same standards and sensibilities to their tasks. The reports of the evaluators, therefore, can never by themselves afford a secure base from which to judge whether one institute was more effective than another, or from which to suggest how future institutes can help to assure their success. Further, the visitor sees only a small segment of the life of an institute, and by his presence he alters the quality of the little he sees. His report on even a single institute, then, is a report on but a part of truth, even though that part may tell more of the whole than any other part.

## Difficulty of Interpretation

These latter remarks suggest the final defect of the means of the Pilot Study. It is sometimes difficult to interpret information and opinions which have been collected in ways which are occasionally tendentious and sometimes intrinsically superficial or narrow. Beyond these difficulties there is that of asking participants and members of the staff in an institute to talk about themselves and one another to a three-day visitor or for the unknown tabulators of the questionnaire. When, for example, the directors were asked in Items 62-73 to rank the virtues of the instructors they had selected to teach in the institute, as a group they all found the same virtues in every instructor. Teachers in institutes are effective primarily because they know their subject, and then because they are skillful in presenting it, are interested in it, and are tolerant and helpful. The invariable order of these responses frustrates any meaningful reading of them. Similarly, when the participants were asked in Items 38-41 to name a weakness of the courses in which they were enrolled, about half chose to check "None of the above" as a happily uninformative way to avoid making a judgment. At least one evaluator also found himself embarrassed by the request on the checklist that he ask the director, the faculty, and the participants their opinions of one another. Certainly the evaluators' own opinions on these matters were consistently more free and sharply defined than any opinions any evaluator managed to get from the participants, directors, and members of the staffs of institutes.

The lesson of these reticences is that participants especially are likely to be more approving of an institute on a questionnaire than they are in conversation with an evaluator. They are likely in turn to be less open and concrete about their discontents in conversation with someone from outside the institute than they are when they are talking to someone who belongs to it in the way that they do. The uses of the data of the Pilot Study, in sum, are necessarily hedged, first, by the fact that the means were sometimes deficient in ways that limit or even help to determine the information and opinions offered, and, second, by the probability that whatever the means used, people studying institutes from outside are more likely to hear the people inside the institute speaking well of it than they are to hear them speaking ill of it. One of the purposes of the Pilot Study was to discover the defects of its instruments, and the final section of this report will suggest how these discoveries ought to change the methods used in future studies. But of more immediate interest is the fact that for all their inutilities and inefficiencies, the questionnaires and the visits of the evaluators did discover a good deal about who attended institutes, about what happened in them during the summer of 1965, and about how and where they promise to move the ways of educating teachers of English both in future institutes and in the established courses of graduate and undergraduate curricula. These conclusions are instructive in themselves. But their interest demonstrates the uses and value of surveys themselves while at the same time suggesting the achievements, problems, and promises of institutes for teachers of English.

## CONCLUSIONS OF THE PILOT STUDY

### Characteristics of the Participants

The most solid data of the Pilot Study is that which delineates who attended the NDEA institutes in English during the summer of 1965. According to the responses to the participants' questionnaires, most (about 70%) of the teachers who came to the institutes were between the ages of twenty-five and forty-five. Over half had taught for at least three but no more than nine years. Most (again about 70%) had taken the equivalent of an undergraduate major in English, if the major may be said to require a minimum of twenty-four hours of credit, including freshman English. Many (about 40%) had taken no graduate courses in English, and only a few (fewer than 20%) have earned more than twenty graduate credits in English, which may be taken as the minimum necessary for a master's or a master of arts in teaching degree. Almost all the participants -- about 92% -- teach in junior or senior high schools. Over half of them teach only in senior high schools, and fewer than 300 of the more than 4,000 participants who responded to the questionnaire teach in elementary schools.

Among the most illuminating questions asked on the participants' questionnaires were those which asked them to name the teaching problem which most vexed them before they enrolled in the institute (Item 73), to judge how well the institute had met the problem (Item 74), and to estimate how useful and exciting they had found the institute in general (Items 14 and 75). Most commonly, teachers said they enrolled in the institute because they wanted to enlarge and repair their own knowledge of the subject they teach, and to learn how to establish priorities among the matters they teach. In general, the participants said they received the instruction they came to get. Almost all participants thought the institutes extremely (44.6%) or at least somewhat (43.8%) useful in solving the most vexing problem in their teaching. Almost all thought the institutes extremely (58.8%) or somewhat (38.6%) useful in general in helping them to teach their students. And even though they were required to choose among somewhat crude distinctions in the question which asked them to describe their response to the institute as a whole, many of the participants (55.5%) were willing to claim that their institute was an exhilarating experience throughout in order to give it the highest praise that they could. Most of the remaining participants (36.8%) were only one rank less fervent in their approval.

### The Success of the Institutes

These general judgments of approval are confirmed in the participants' responses to other questions, in their remarks on the "Free Response" section of their questionnaires, in the responses to the director-staff questionnaires, and in the evaluators' reports. About half the participants thought they were asked to read and write too much (Item 72). But most approved of their institute's length and schedule of social and supplementary activities (Items 67, 70, and 71). Members of the staffs judged their institutes to be effective (Item 14) with almost exactly the same degree of enthusiasm as the participants (58.8% of the staff and 58.8% of the participants thought the institutes extremely successful, and 36.7% of the staff and 38.6% of the participants thought them successful). Members of the staffs were also satisfied with the length, size, participants, and even the kind and amount of reading and writing assigned in the institutes (Items 7, 8, 17, and 75). These satisfactions also shine through the voluntary comments of both participants and members of the staffs of the institutes (Appendix C). This satisfaction is especially impressive when it is expressed in remarks about some topics which concern both the participants and their teachers, such as the frequent concern of both that the courses of institutes concentrate on the subject of English while opening ways for the participants themselves to work out practical applications. Finally, although the evaluators who visited some of the institutes are in their remarks less consistently laudatory, they too were unfailingly impressed by the spirit of advancement and achievement which seems to inform a successful institute, a perceptible sense that in it most people are working very hard to master fresh materials and ideas which they believe to be useful for the teaching of English.

## How the Institutes Succeeded

The general expressions of approval cannot bear a great deal of weight. They are general, and tabulations of responses from all the institutes disguise the equally instructive failures of a few. Further, the very favorable judgments of the participants undoubtedly proceed from gratitude, loyalty, self-esteem, and other quite proper motives as well as from their genuine confidence that at the end of the summer they know more about their subject and how to teach it than they did at the beginning. The skepticism with which one must regard the opinions of teachers about their own teaching is tempered by the frequency with which in their voluntary comments members of the institutes' faculties consider how to do it better next year. But it is not to be expected that a faculty which has worked hard all summer will in the last week of an institute harshly judge its quality and effectiveness, especially when the instrument by which they are asked to make this judgment seems insensitive to the subtler measures between entire success and unhappy failure.

The questionnaires also provide information, however, which is more specific but equally heartening as these judgments of general approval. Many participants, for example, thought the courses in literature most useful in teaching them a knowledge of close reading, the courses in language most useful in teaching them a knowledge of different grammars and in persuading them that language is a proper field of study, and the courses in composition most useful in demonstrating ways to evoke good writing from their own students (Items 15-26). It is not surprising that the instructors of the courses in literature, language, and composition also named these matters as those they thought likely to be most influential on the teaching of the participants; presumably, these are the matters on which the instructors also spent much of their time and force (Items 59-61). Nor is it surprising that the changes in their teaching the participants most frequently predict will occur when they return to their schools, are those that proceed from what they have learned in the institute (Items 35-37). They will begin to emphasize close reading in their teaching of literature and to connect assignments in composition and literature. They plan to emphasize the structure of sentences rather than the parts of speech and to introduce units on such topics as usage and the history of language into their teaching of grammar. They plan to assign short, frequent themes which can be closely discussed in class when they teach composition. In short, the participants in general learned and said they would put to use what the faculty of the institutes taught and thought was useful. That is exactly what institutes are supposed to do; nonetheless it is encouraging to find that the data of the Pilot Study specifies the ways in which the institutes of 1965 succeeded.

It is also encouraging that those many participants who came to the institutes most conscious of their own deficiencies were the participants who judged their institute most favorably. Of the 1104 participants who identified their own lack of confidence in their knowledge of their subject as their most vexing problem, 65% thought that the institute had met this problem "To a great degree" and over half said that the institute as a whole was "Extremely useful." Of the 953 participants who identified their most vexing problem in teaching as an uncertainty about which topics are the most significant, 53% thought that the institute had met the problem "To a great degree" and 58.6% thought the institute as a whole to be "Extremely useful" (Appendix B, Tables 7 and 3). These teachers, in short, were not just gratified in a general way by their participation in an institute. They could describe their expectations from the institute and describe the change in their teaching brought about when the institute met their expectations.

There is also a clear relationship between age and years of teaching experience on the one hand, and favorable judgments of the institute on the other. In the tabulations of responses from all the institutes, older and more experienced teachers are more likely than younger teachers to find the institute exhilarating, extremely useful in general, and greatly useful in meeting the main problem in their own teaching (Appendix B, Tables 1, 2, and 6). Further, although the evidence is not consistent or decisive, teachers with three to nine years of experience and teachers with relatively few undergraduate and graduate credits in English tended to find values in the courses in their institutes somewhat different from those named by teachers with more or less experience and who had received more previous instruction in English. For example, on the participants' questionnaire, teachers with three to nine years experience chose "Knowledge of rhetorical principles" and "Knowledge of the current grammars" as the principal values of the courses in composition and language more frequently than other participants (Appendix B, Tables 10 and 9). The relationship between the number of graduate and undergraduate credits in English and the choice of "Your own improved writing" as the principal value of the composition courses is almost wholly inverse -- the fewer the credits, the more frequently this value was named (Appendix B, Table 10). Similarly, secondary school teachers chose "Knowledge and techniques of close reading" as the principal value of the courses in literature more frequently than elementary school teachers, who tended to choose "Acquaintance with literature and writers new to you" (Appendix B, Table 8).

These latter relationships, based as they are on the responses of groups of disparate sizes (over half of the participants had three to nine years of experience teaching, only about one-fourth had earned fewer than twenty hours of undergraduate credit in English, and fewer than 10% taught in elementary schools), are teasing rather than conclusive. But when they are put together with the relationships between favorable judgments of the institute on the one hand, and age and years of experience on the other, and when to them is added the specific satisfactions named by teachers who came to the institutes with specific expectations, all these relationships suggest that the institutes did achieve some of the purposes for which they were established. In them teachers of English did learn lessons they put immediately to work in their own classrooms; in them teachers with different problems and responsibilities did learn something peculiarly appropriate to their needs; and in them teachers who had been out of school and in service for five or more years were taught with especially good effect.

## Where the Institutes Failed

The data of the Pilot Study can also be used to specify some of the disappointments and missed opportunities of the institutes of 1965. In only a few institutes were the dimensions of these failures large enough to compromise seriously their effectiveness. On the whole, it can be said that almost all the institutes of 1965 ended with more successes than failures. But the evidence of their effectiveness is almost always accompanied by recurrent suggestions of how and why they failed to be as effective as they can be in the future. The evidence of two difficulties in particular appears repeatedly in the responses to the questionnaires and in the evaluators' reports. First, there was a tension between matter and method, the claims of the subject of English and the requirements of teaching it in the schools, which was often profitable but was also often dissonant and distracting. The effect of this tension appeared most often in the workshops but with significant frequency in the other courses taught in the institute and in the attitudes of the instructors and participants toward the institute and one another. Second, there runs through the institutes a strain of parochialism which did not impair their effectiveness but which did determine that most of the institutes of 1965 were effective within familiar and relatively narrow boundaries. In particular, the people who planned and taught in the institutes usually offered a conventional sequence of courses in language, literature, and composition and did not customarily experiment with new ways of teaching teachers. They only rarely enlisted ideas and faculty from disciplines other than English. And they did not often attempt to enroll as participants teachers who taught below the high school grades with which college teachers have recently become familiar.

## The Workshops

As in the CEEB institutes of 1962, the workshops were the least successful part of the curriculum. They were planned to connect the courses of the institutes to one another and to translate the ideas and information set out in the institute's classrooms into ideas and information useful in the participants' own classrooms. The workshops, if those taught in the institutes visited by evaluators were representative, were organized in almost as many ways as there were institutes. Some institutes offered no workshop. Those that did scheduled them at the beginning, at the end, or throughout the institute; conducted them as seminars, demonstration classes, or conventional discussion groups; and used guest lecturers, discussion leaders and films.

Nothing seems to have worked well. When in their questionnaires the participants (Items 41, 45, and 47) and members of the faculty (Item 34) were asked to choose a phrase describing the benefits and weaknesses of the workshops, their responses were no more decisive than those to similar questions about other courses. But voluntary comments on the workshops are frequent, forceful, and uncomforting. Some members of the staffs suggest that the workshops be eliminated, others that they be reorganized, and still other just don't know and can only ask, as one instructor put it, "If a workshop, what should it try to do?" Participants usually were content to wish that the workshop had been either more practical or more closely connected to the other courses in the institute -- which is to say that they wished the workshop had done what it was designed to do. These wishes are echoed in the reports of the evaluators. If an institute did not offer a workshop, its visitor usually found the participants anxious about the relevance of all they were learning to what they had to teach. If the institute did offer a workshop, the evaluator often reported that the participants were unsure of its purpose or disappointed in its efficacy. The evaluators themselves often shared this latter opinion. Even the directors of the institute, in their final reports, were characteristically defensive about the workshop, at best discussing it as a kind of puzzle they had not yet solved.

The reasons for the ineffectiveness of the workshops are as varied as the ways in which they were organized. The evaluators' reports criticize some workshops for being badly placed in the curriculum, others for being too narrowly committed to a single idea about teaching, or shapeless in their assemblage of an assortment of practical bits of advice and admonition, or simply inconsonant in their practical simplicity with the tone and matter of the other courses. The place of the workshop in the institute -- shunted off to the afternoons or to the end of the term; frequently denied the status of carrying graduate credit; often taught by the only secondary school teacher on the staff -- also suggests that, however much they may have worried about it, directors of institutes did not conceive the workshop to be as important as the other courses. Apparently the instructors of the other courses agreed. Certainly the instructors in the workshop seem to have known more about the other courses than the instructors of other courses knew about the workshop, or even about courses they were not teaching. Fewer than half (41%) of the instructors participated regularly in the workshop (Item 19), while three-fourths (76.2%) of the supervisors of the workshops said they were acquainted "To a great degree" with the content of other courses (Item 13; compare the responses to Item 11, in which a little over half the instructors of the other courses say that they were familiar with the content of courses other than their own). One of the sources of the difficulties of the workshops seems simply to be that they were not always taken seriously.

## Other Courses in the Institute

But most of the directors, and all the evaluators, think that the puzzle of the workshops ought to be solved rather than abandoned. For the difficulty of the workshop is the difficulty of institutes themselves. Like its workshop, an institute as a whole must teach students without forgetting that they are also teachers, and teach teachers without diminishing the institute's primary commitment to the discipline of English rather than to pedogogy. This difficulty appeared in the other courses too. The reports of the evaluators, and occasional comments on the participants' questionnaires, indicate that there are several ways in which the kinds of courses an institute offers can compromise its effectiveness. One way is to take over undergraduate or graduate courses without changing them: language courses in particular were frequently so transplanted, frequently with unfortunate results. Another way is to teach courses which are narrowly designed to advocate a single idea or procedure to which the instructor is partisan, such as courses in literature which were given to the methods of a single critic or mode of criticism. On the other hand, courses which tried for a broad survey, especially of literature, were also frequently judged by the evaluators and participants to be ineffective. So were courses which tried to shape themselves to answer questions and needs the participants framed for themselves. (It is worth noting here that courses in composition, which in his report on the institutes of 1962 John Gerber singled out as likely to become something akin to freshman English and as such to be inappropriate to a post-baccalaureate institute, were frequently praised by the evaluators. Either the evaluators have become inured to the necessity of teaching English teachers how to write, or teachers of composition have developed ways -- many composition courses were arranged around a relatively sophisticated study of rhetoric -- to teach teachers how to write without seeming to be teaching courses in freshman composition.) The conclusion to be drawn from these observations is not new or hard to find. An institute is neither a graduate nor an undergraduate school. Nor should it be like those traditional pedogogical colloquia in which teachers merely exchange experiences and helpful hints. Like the workshops, the other courses of an institute have to achieve an identity some place between the conventional ways of teaching the matter and the methods of English.

## Faculty in the Institutes

Some of the difficulties about the character of courses in the institutes of 1965 may really be difficulties about the ways in which they were taught. Several evaluators, some participants, and many directors, think that college teachers lecture too frequently, listen too little, and are unhappily ready to ride hobby horses all summer long. Other evaluators, and probably most participants, think that college teachers are as a rule uneducated and somewhat cavalier in their reluctance to learn about the actualities of teaching in elementary and secondary schools. (The faculty of the institutes themselves are characteristically less concerned about the necessity for first-hand knowledge of the schools: see the responses to Item 29 on the director-staff questionnaire.) All the evaluators are explicit about the great tact needed to instruct teachers who are quick to complain that they are being talked down to, or being talked to as if they were doctoral candidates, or simply not being allowed to talk themselves. On the other hand, the participants were typically impatient with instructors who allowed their students to set the pace and emphasis of their courses: participants apparently did not come to the institutes just to listen to one another.

Again, the difficulty is like that apparent in the workshops; and again, it is easier to see the problem than its solution. One evaluator, for example, believes that only elementary and secondary school teachers should conduct workshops. Another evaluator writes, "Institute workshops should be run by a college teacher. . . who attends all classes and correlates subject-matter and teaching procedures, telling participants what he thinks they should do in school and discussing with them why it should or can be done and why not. If the school curriculum is to be reformed, this is the perfect opportunity for higher education to direct it in English -- as science and foreign languages have directed theirs." The debate is not just about the teachers of workshops, nor is it fundamentally about the relative effectiveness of drawing institute faculty from the schools and from colleges. The idea of NDEA institutes is that teaching in the schools will be improved by instructing teachers in the discipline they teach. Even the teacher of a workshop -- perhaps especially the teacher of a workshop -- must therefore be able to stand with authority where the participants cannot, in his subject rather than in their classrooms. But the opinions and speculations collected in the Pilot Study suggest that an instructor in an institute compromises his effectiveness if he simply teaches his subject, just as he denies the institute if he concentrates on the pedogogy of his subject. He must here again walk a line between his interest in his subject and the participants' interest in teaching it, and learn, as many of the faculty of the institutes of 1965 had yet to learn, how to lead the participants as students while remembering that they are colleagues.

## The Participants

If some of the faculty of institutes have something to learn about teaching in institutes, some of the participants have something to learn about attending them. The faculty, directors, and evaluators all praise the diligence and spirit of the participants. But some instructors and evaluators also remarked a narrow and limiting practicality abroad among the participants. As one evaluator put it, "Participants are tremendous reductionists. They want the answer -- to learn one sure way to do something, one big idea which will open up a subject, one grammar, the way to read a poem." Expectations such as these undoubtedly lay beneath some of the participants' disappointment in the courses and faculty of the institutes. It is well to remember that most participants left their institutes saying that they had learned how to improve their teaching. Those who professed to be disappointed, or who were disappointed even though they said they were pleased, were undoubtedly in part distressed by failures in the institutes themselves. But the failure was in part theirs too, a failure to comprehend the nature of the task the institute set for itself. Many participants have yet to learn, or yet to accept, that at bottom the purpose of institutes like those taught in 1965 is not to teach them how to teach English. Their purpose is rather to teach a carefully organized body of knowledge which is full enough to suggest both its own pedogogy and the direction and means of its further study. If some of the faculty will not be fully effective in institutes until they modify the courses they teach and their habits of teaching, so also many elementary and secondary school teachers will not fully profit from institutes until they modify and elevate their expectations of what an institute proposes to do for them.

## The Parochialism of the Institutes

The failure to mediate fruitfully between the claims of matter and method -- common in the workshops and more than occasional in the ways other courses were planned, taught, and attended -- was an event which prevented some of the institutes which were taught in 1965 from being as effective as they could have been. The parochialism of the institutes of 1965 did not qualify their effectiveness. It did, however, limit their effects and at least postpone some of the promises of the idea of the institute itself. As a factor which prevented benefits from even being attempted, then, the narrowness of the plans and purposes of the institutes of 1965 may be called one of their failures.

For example, in these first NDEA institutes, college teachers of English understandably attempted the service to their profession with which some of them have recently become familiar, teaching the senior high school teachers who constituted well over half the enrollment in the institutes. Further, seventy of the institutes taught were modeled on the language, literature, composition plan of the CEEB institutes of 1962. There is no necessary virtue in novelty, and it is still necessary and useful to do as well or better what was well-done three years ago. But this tendency to reproduce patterns intended to educate secondary school teachers neglected the interests of the few teachers in the primary and

and intermediate grades who were enrolled in the institutes. The two problems these teachers identified more often than other teachers as their most vexing -- the low reading ability of their students and the difficulty of accommodating individual differences -- were those they and other teachers to whom the same problems were central found the institutes least satisfactory in helping them to meet (Appendix B, Tables 5 and 7).

There were other missed opportunities. Except for the necessary levies on departments of linguistics and schools of education, very few directors of institutes invited to their faculties, or enlisted as occasional lecturers, college teachers in other disciplines, writers, and other people engaged in similarly apt pursuits. Nor did most directors of institutes in large universities go outside their universities, or even their departments, when they planned the institute. Only the directors of institutes in small schools given largely to the education of teachers customarily talked to teachers and administrators in the schools during the months in which the institutes were planned. And although there are several reasons for their striking lack of interest in using new materials (See Appendix E), one reason college teachers of English did not make much use of new materials in the institutes of 1965 is that they had not troubled to learn much about their value and availability.

Finally, there were some disquieting inattentions. In institutes conducted in large departments of English, only a few of the faculty were directly involved in the planning of the institute, although most of the faculty in residence during the summer were aware of the institute and at least fitfully interested in its activities. The directors of institutes at large universities frequently stated in their reports, or to the evaluators, that they foresaw no changes in the curricula of their departments in consequence of the institute. It is not difficult to conclude that in most departments of English, the NDEA institute slipped easily into a familiar slot. The faculty members who habitually agree to teach teachers agreed again to teach the kind of teachers they had taught before. However great the changes wrought in the participants, at the end of the summer the department and the institution were, at many large universities in particular, exactly as they were at the beginning.

## The Promises of the Institutes

What did not happen in the institutes of 1965 may, however, be a promise of what can happen. For example, even though they were not well-served, elementary school teachers were the most enthusiastic group of participants in the institutes. Two-thirds of the teachers of the primary schools described their institutes as exhilerating throughout (Appendix B, Table 1). About half the teachers of primary and intermediate grades also claimed that the institute met their most vexing problem in teaching "To a great degree," even though many of them identified that problem as one of those which, according to the answers to another question, the institutes on the whole did not meet very effectively (Appendix B, Tables 6 and 7). This approval must measure a general excitement which overbears the perceptible fact that the institutes did not give much attention to matters which centrally concerned many of these teachers.

So too on their questionnaires the participants consistently judged special institutes more favorably than general institutes. Asked to judge the usefulness of their institute, 63.7% of the participants in special institutes called them extremely useful, as against 56.4% of the participants in general institutes; and

58.2% of the participants in special institutes found them exhilerating, as against 54% of the participants in general institutes. Exceptions to this tendency are the special institutes in linguistics and in literature, which were consistently judged least favorably by their participants. Only 42% of their participants judged the special insitutes in linguistics to be extremely useful, for example, while 63.7% of the participants in all special institutes awarded them this high approval. On the other hand, special institutes in composition, literature and composition, and linguistics and composition were judged more favorably than any other kind of institute (See Appendix B, Tables 1, 2, and 6).

Even the fact that two-thirds of the institutes were modeled on the plan of the CEEB institutes can be turned around to read more like a promise than a limitation. One-third of the institutes tried different patterns, many of them new and deliberately experimental, some of them recruiting for their faculties writers, psychologists, theatrical designers and directors, sociologists, and others with similarly relevant talents. In their very first year, in short, NDEA institutes in English reached, however tentatively, for instructors, students, courses, and purposes new to the ways of educating teachers. And when they reached to enroll elementary school teachers or to plan special institutes, they often touched needs and responses which vindicated their experiment. Some of the new promises of institutes, in short, have already been realized.

The institutes have not yet moved to realize their promise as instruments for changing the ways teachers are educated in established undergraduate and graduate curricula. The college teachers of English who were concerned enough about these matters to plan and teach in the institutes of 1965 are still, for the most part, poised on the shallow shore of their engagement. They are not yet ready wholly to commit their energies and imaginations to adapting all they know and can do to be fully effective in the delicate task of teaching teachers. They are not yet audacious enough, most of them, to break out of familiar patterns and to use the formulations of other disciplines. They are not yet persuaded, many of them, that one of the sources of the problem they have agreed to confront lies not before but behind them, in the courses they teach all during the academic year to students who will in a few years be teaching in classrooms like those of the teachers who come to the institutes. (One of the most striking facts of the Pilot Study is that 70% of the teachers who came to the institutes had already taken the equivalent of an English major.) It is not even certain, for that matter, that the institutes really will prove to be effective when the participants return to their classrooms, which is where their effectiveness must finally be measured. Only a few institutes were awarded funds for a follow-up study. Other directors planned at least to meet with the alumni of their institutes during the school year, but most of these plans were necessarily improvised and incomplete.

## THE INSTITUTES: SUMMARY

The information and opinions collected in the Pilot Study provide clear answers to two of the fundamental questions with which the Study began: What is an institute, and how does the kind of education it offers differ from that offered in the undergraduate and graduate curricula in which teachers of English are conventionally instructed in their subject? Institutes are not versions of undergraduate and graduate programs which happen to enroll nothing but teachers. Those taught in the summer of 1965 at least did achieve a life and identity of their own. The reports of the visitors are usually explicit about the special tone which marks an institute. Through the remarks of the participants, and sometimes of the instructors, there also runs a sense of having been involved in something different and peculiarly important which lifts these judgments a pitch beyond the level of ordinary approval. People who attend institutes are excited by them, loyal to them, even on occasion angry at them with an intensity unfamiliar in college classrooms. They seem also to enjoy one another enormously; probably the great single event for many participants was their discovery of one another, their pleasure in the company for four or five or six weeks of other teachers who share their concerns and intentions. Even though the instructors in the institutes were as a group less incandescent in their excitement, they too were often caught up with the participants in this community of concerns and purposes. When the instructors could see and sustain it, they had available to them a relationship with the students much different from that customarily established between graduate students and their teachers. In one sense, the instructor was still the person who knows a subject, and the participants were people who wanted to learn it. But at the same time, when the institute was what institutes can be, instructors and participants were enabled to meet on ground on which each had his own authority, within a discipline to which each had responsibilities of different kinds but of equal weight and consequence.

The data of the Pilot Study makes it possible to specify some of the sources of the peculiar character and tone of an institute, some of the reasons certain institutes are more effective than others, and some of the steps those who plan and participate in future institutes can take to help assure their effectiveness. In general, the institutes of 1965 were successful. In this first year of NDEA institutes, it was perhaps difficult not to be effective, so large and various were the inadequacies to be remedied. The inadequacies which were most directly addressed, however, were those of secondary school teachers with three to ten years experience, and the institutes of 1965 were at least effective in helping elementary school teachers. If the success of institutes were to be measured by the visible changes they will work in the teaching of those who attended them -- rather than by their enthusiasm during the last week of the institute -- it is certain that success would lie with those institutes which were organized to resolve clearly defined difficulties, rather than with those which surrounded their participants with ideas and books in the trust that some of them would prove useful. The lesson, not surprisingly, has to do with precision. As the success of institutes changes the relatively familiar problems, it will be all the more useful and necessary that the college teachers of English who organize institutes consult with teachers and administrators in the schools, and with other college teachers, in order to fit their institutes to new demands and opportunities.

The evidence of the Pilot Study that special institutes were judged more useful by their participants than general institutes must be considered very carefully. It was not true of all special institutes. Those given wholly to the study of linguistics or literature disappointed the expectations of their participants more frequently than general institutes did. On the other hand, the most successful institutes were those which in some way taught composition, either as part of a general institute or, especially, in a special institute which emphasized composition. Now composition is the topic which most secondary school teachers probably find most difficult to teach. Much of their approval of institutes which taught composition, therefore, may come from their gratitude for instruction in a topic more clearly practical than the more recondite disciplines of linguistics and literary analysis. On the other hand, composition can readily be taught in conjunction with other topics, for one of the principal ends in teaching people how to write is to help them express ideas learned in other studies. The participants' approval of special institutes in the teaching of composition, then, may be taken in part as a recommendation not so much against general institutes as, again, for precision and practicality. There is little profit in requiring that institutes restrict themselves to meeting only those needs participants can articulate for themselves. But there is some loss in neglecting the participants' ideas of how their own inadequacies are to be repaired. Future institutes ought not all to be given to the study of a single topic, nor should they all include instruction in composition. But they should strive to achieve ends as sharply defined as those of a special institute. And whether they concentrate on a single topic or try to connect the study of several matters, they all need somehow to discover topics and ways to teach which furnish what the study of composition seems to have given the participants in the institutes of 1965 -- the sense that their study was at once immediately useful to them as teachers and clearly connected to the other matters they study and teach.

Except for the difference in the participants' opinions of special and general institutes, the data of the Pilot Study do not suggest that any of the other measurable characteristics of institutes have much to do with determining or predicting their effectiveness. The evaluators visited institutes which enrolled from 200 to thirty or forty participants and were in session from three to eight weeks. Neither the evaluators' reports, nor the responses to the questionnaires, suggest that these variations were in themselves important. Nor does it seem to matter where an institute was taught, whether in a small college, or university, or teachers' college. Nor are the evaluators impressed -- although the directors of institutes are deeply impressed -- by the necessity of selecting a relatively homogeneous group of participants. Even in the one institute visited in which the existence of a harshly superior group of relatively advanced participants alternately discouraged and irritated other participants new to graduate study, the evaluator concluded that the source of the really damaging dissonances in the institute was not disparities in the educations of the participants, but defects in the organization and administration of the institute.

The evaluators, on the other hand, were more impressed than the directors could properly be with the importance of the director of the institute. None of the three institutes which were evaluated most favorably by their visitors was unusually ingenious in its plan. But each was administered by a director of great experience and perception. Nor were the three institutes judged most unfavorably by the evaluators suffering from any defect more crippling than the inability of their directors to see and correct faults which could have been repaired. A director can, as he did in all the institutes which the evaluators considered to be uncommonly effective, improvise to alleviate or compensate for some of the impediments to effectiveness which appeared during the terms of one institute or another: guest lecturers who pull the program away from its central purposes, housing which disperses or dissatisfies the participants, a tightly planned daily schedule which leaves them no time to move on their own. More important, a director of tact and invention can inform with uncommon cogency an ordinarily conceived and conducted institute; and he can also exploit the unforeseen possibilities, and retrieve the inevitable miscalculations, of an institute which tries, as institutes increasingly will try, for something new and not yet achieved.

But at its heart, the question of why an institute is effective comes back to the questions put forward at the beginning of the Pilot Study, what an institute is, and how it is different from other kinds of education. An NDEA institute in English taught in the summer of 1965 was a special and identifiable kind of education. It tried to change the ways of teaching English in schools by educating teachers in the several facets of their subject; it tried to enlarge the competence of elementary and secondary school teachers by enrolling them in a curriculum largely prepared and taught by college teachers. Its purposes and character were not those of conventional graduate or undergraduate instruction, in which college teachers are responsible only that their subject be understood. Nor were its purposes and character those of conventional in-service institutes or seminars in which groups of teachers instruct one another in the difficulties and current practices of their profession. An NDEA institute was both liberal and professional. It proposed to teach the discipline of English, and it enlisted the talents of a faculty whose habit is to teach as if simply to learn about language and literature is sufficient reason for studying them. It also proposed to teach teachers, and it necessarily enrolled people who were continually aware that the ultimate value of the institute lay not within how well they performed in its classrooms, but by how differently and well everybody in the institute performed in the classrooms to which they returned at the summer's end. If, in short, the institutes of 1965 did in general achieve a tone and identity of their own, they did so because they sought to achieve a character and purpose different from those of other ways of teaching English.

It follows that,fundamentally, an institute will succeed in the measure that the character and intentions of its courses, faculty, and participants are adapted to its special character and movement. The most important conclusions of the Pilot Study are those which concern these central components of an institute. It is clear that it is equally ineffective to incorporate graduate and undergraduate courses into the program of an institute and to permit any of the institute's courses to move at the pace and with the wishes of the participants. It is clear that instructors in an institute must somehow address the participants as teachers as well as students of the discipline of English, and that therefore the habits learned in teaching college students, secondary school students, and courses in pedogogy are all inappropriate. It is clear too that if the instructors in institutes must revise some of their courses and habits to be effective, participants in institutes must alter, and usually elevate, their expectations. They must learn to learn from the liberal as well as the professional intentions of an institute. They must learn not to ask that an institute provide simple solutions to complex difficulties, or any fully worked-out solutions at all to the special problems of their own schools. Finally, it is clear that an institute must be somewhat more tightly knit than a conventional summer-school term, and considerably more loosely arranged than the traditional gatherings of teachers in which highly organized groups of people swarm all over one or two topics for several highly organized days or weeks. An institute ought to be planned to hang together, as the discrete courses of a summer-school curriculum do not. But an institute ought also to have spaces in it, hours and afternoons in which the participants can learn from one another, discover for themselves, or simply escape the institute entirely. It is the participants who finally must prove the institute by working out for themselves its uses in their schools. An institute can set in motion this necessary consequence by leading the participants to ponder the uses of their subject while they are engaged in extending their knowledge of it.

The special character and purposes of institutes suggest not only the ways and reasons that institutes succeed or fail. They also suggest an answer to another question with which the Pilot Study began, whether institutes are a temporary means of stopping up the holes left in previous education or whether their uses are more than temporary and remedial. As they are defined in the proposals and the final reports of their directors, the institutes of 1965 were planned to achieve two large and usually concurrent purposes: to instruct teachers of English in a new knowledge of and new attitudes toward their subject; and to confirm and enlarge the participants', and the instructors', sense of themselves as teachers engaged in the common task of teaching the same subject at different levels and in different ways.

The first purpose could have been achieved within a conventional graduate or undergraduate curriculum. If to teach more effectively, teachers of English need only to know, for example, something more about the several grammars now considered useful, something more about the procedures of the several critical methods now current, and something more about the history and uses of rhetoric, then the teaching of English in elementary and secondary schools can be improved in the college classrooms in which elementary and secondary school teachers are prepared initially. Institutes may at the moment be necessary to repair the apparent failure to teach these matters to teachers now in service when they were graduate and undergraduate students. Institutes may always be useful as a convenient means to bring up to date teachers who have been out of college long enough for new ideas and materials to have been advanced and created. But colleges and universities exist to teach new information and ideas. If institutes do no more than to teach language, literature, and composition to teachers who have already graduated from a course of instruction which exists to do the same thing, then some of the money and energy which is now being invested in institutes would be better invested in a revision of the curricula whose failures have required the invention of institutes. Institutes may serve during this revision as laboratories in which college teachers learn how to improve their own teaching of prospective teachers while they help to improve that of teachers in service. But as instruments simply for the teaching of the subject of English, they are fundamentally redundant.

But institutes are not simply instruments for teaching English. They are also a means of _teaching teachers_ of English. Both words are important. Because an institute enrolls only teachers, its instruction has or is given an immediacy and relevance impossible to students who have not yet taught, and unlikely among teachers who for a summer or a term have become students in a graduate curriculum given to the historical and analytical study of language and literature. At the same time, the central interest of the institutes of 1965 was defined as the study of the matter which constitutes English. It is this conjunction of the _discipline_ and the _profession_, of a concentration on the subject of English in the continual presence of people who have been selected not because they wanted to study English but _because they teach it_, that seemed to most participants to distinguish an institute from undergraduate and graduate study on the one hand, and from conventional workshops and institutes in pedogogy on the other. The institutes of 1965 were places in which teachers met to study their subject. Because they were teachers, they learned more than their subject. They learned, or could learn, something about how all they know fits into all there is to know, and something about how what they do in their classroom fits with all there is to be done. They learned, literally, who they are. Simply by enabling them to come to their subject as teachers, the institutes made it possible for them to see themselves, not as teachers and not as people studying English, but as what they are -- teachers of English.

To say that the institutes conducted in 1965 are different from other ways of educating teachers is not to say that they are a permanently necessary kind of education whose means and ends will always properly lie outside the curricula of colleges and universities. The present necessity for institutes measures not only the inadequacy of the teaching of English in elementary and secondary schools but also the inadequacy of the teaching of English in the colleges which prepared the teachers themselves. Everything that is done effectively in an institute -- every topic that it seems to teach profitably, every course and plan that seems productive -- ought to be studied to see if it can be taken into the conventional undergraduate and graduate curricula in which prospective teachers study. It can be presumed that just as courses from the regular curriculum are not effective in institutes unless they are revised, so institute courses must be adapted to the life and nature of undergraduate and graduate study. But some,perhaps in time, most of the information and ideas broadcast by the institutes of 1965 can be taught with equal efficacy in departments of English. Only the "spirit" of the institute will be hard to transfer to the less concentrated college program.

To move to the undergraduate and graduate curricula some of the tasks now undertaken in institutes would permit institutes to work more freely and imaginatively at tasks and purposes which are peculiarly appropriate to their nature. One of these purposes is simply to continue to provide a setting in which college, secondary, and elementary school teachers of English can enlarge and connect what each of them knows about his subject and how it can be taught. Again, one of the ultimate effects of this alliance ought to be to renew the conventional curriculum as it takes over topics and purposes the institutes have tried and proved. More interesting, although not more valuable, is the possibility of using institutes to undertake tasks colleges and universities perhaps can never undertake. The parochialism of the institutes of 1965 was a product of familiarity. Because college teachers have recently become accustomed to the necessity, if they are not yet easy with the means, of teaching secondary school teachers, they quite naturally turned to this necessity when they planned institutes. As some of the lessons of the summer of 1965 move back to change the curricula in college departments of English, institutes can move ahead to make college teachers more familiar with other necessities. The education of elementary school teachers, for example. It is not likely, given the different demands of programs offered in a college department of English and those leading to certification in the elementary schools, that college teachers of English can ever teach, and learn from, elementary school teachers as easily during a regular academic year as they can during a summer institute. Or, to suggest other examples, the relevance for the teaching of English of the ways drama is discussed by teachers of theater and rhetoric by teachers of speech; or how sociologists study the reciprocities between written discourse and its culture, and how psychologists and anthropologists study language and learning - here too an institute offers teachers of English a means of getting out of their departments to learn and teach in ways not easily accommodated within the structure of a college or university.

That institutes can serve as a kind of experimental agent defining new possibilities and dissolving old reluctances and indifferences has already been demonstrated. In the conclusion to his report on the institutes taught in the summer of 1962, John Gerber remarked, "If the general competence of high-school teachers can be substantially improved within a summer session, institutes modelled on the CEEB plan seem to be the most promising means for doing it" (p.35). Because Mr. Gerber's study followed the participants into their own classrooms to learn whether the institutes' instruction really had the effects on their teaching it was intended to have, his cautious endorsement is more soundly based than the more exultant claims of satisfaction and success which come from the data of the Pilot Study. Yet by several measures the institutes of 1965 seem to mark an advance during the three years which have followed the teaching of the CEEB institutes. Those visitors who observed both the institutes of 1962 and those of 1965 remarked the greater excitement and openness of the latter. Certainly the judgments of the participants of both years are markedly different. Asked after they had returned to their schools for their opinion about the benefits of the summer, the participants in the institutes of 1962 were considerably more reluctant than their counterparts three years later to choose the most favorable descriptions possible.

Responses of Participants in Institutes of 1962:

As you look back on the Institute now, how much do you feel it added to your intellectual growth . . . [and] to your skill as a teacher?

| | Intellectual growth | Skill as Teacher |
|---|---|---|
| Very greatly | 22% | 10% |
| Greatly | 43% | 31% |
| Moderately | 23.5% | 41% |
| Little | 6.5% | 13% |
| Very little | 4% | 5% |

Even allowing that six months later the approval of the participants in the institutes of 1965 might have been less fervent than it was during the final weeks of the summer, their responses to comparable questions are decidedly more favorable.

Responses of Participants of Institutes of 1965:

How useful was the Institute in preparing you to handle your own teaching problems? Check the item below which best describes the Institute experience for you.

| | |
|---|---|
| Extremely useful | 58.8% |
| Somewhat useful | 38.6% |
| Not at all useful | 1.3% |

| | |
|---|---|
| Exhilarating throughout | 55.5% |
| Occasionally stimulating | 36.8% |
| No different from usual institute study | 1.4% |
| Generally disappointing | 5.4% |

These differences are not simply the result of differences in the plan or conduct of the institutes during the two summers. Over two-thirds of the NDEA institutes were in fact modeled on the CEEB institutes. It is the people who taught in and attended the institutes of 1965 who are different, and so is the entire tone with which this kind of education is conducted. One of the difficulties of the CEEB institutes was that, even with a year's planning in advance, some directors did not receive enough applications to enable them to maintain standards they considered properly rigorous. There were at least two wholly qualified applicants for every place in the institutes of 1965. Even though the institutes of 1965 were open to more teachers than those of 1962, which enrolled only secondary school teachers of college-bound students, the response of teachers suggests a readiness to change the ways of teaching which simply did not seem to exist three years ago.

Another of the disappointments recorded in Mr. Gerber's study was, in his words, that "Very few of the English departments involved seemed, at the time, to consider the Institutes an important departmental enterprise. In five departments [of the twenty which taught institutes] even the chairman seemed indifferent. Occasionally, our Evaluators encountered members of English departments who were not even aware of the presence of an institute on their campus" (p. 8). The visitors to the institutes of 1965 reported no such diffidence, and the directors' reports and their responses to their questionnaires indicate that usually the director initiated and planned an institute with the full and informed cooperation of his chairman and some of his colleagues, even though he may have been less diligent or successful in canvassing advice and support outside his department. It is another question how far this endorsement of the idea which institutes embody penetrates into departments of English. But it is fair to say, from the evidence of the visitors' reports and remarks of the directors of the institutes, that at least some members of most college departments of English have by and large come to accept the idea that one of their responsibilities is to do something to improve the teaching of English to pupils in elementary and secondary schools. Furthermore, the variety of plans and purposes tried in the institutes of 1965 demonstrates that at least some college departments of English have decided that it is part of their responsibility to improve the teaching of English not only to those secondary school students who are going on to college, but to elementary school students, to culturally deprived students, to all high school students whether or not they plan to continue their educations.

What has happened, in sum, is that the institutes of 1965 have in a real sense stood on the shoulders of those taught in 1962. If the NDEA institutes generated and used a larger excitement than their predecessors, if elementary and secondary school teachers of English are more ready to attend and college teachers more willing to teach in institutes, if the directors of institutes are more ambitious and various in their plans, it is all in large part because the trials, the successes, and the very existence of the CEEB institutes have persuaded teachers of English that they must and can do something to improve the ways their subject is taught. The institutes of 1965, and their successors, can perform the same service. They can repair -- many undoubtedly already have repaired -- the inadequacies permitted by the current practices of preparing people to teach English. They can also, because of the relative ease with which their faculties can experiment in their patterns, suggest how the established ways of educating teachers can be revised and amplified. And because of the peculiar energy and excitement the life of an institute seems to hold, they can experiment and innovate in ways a conventional curriculum cannot. Some of these innovations will advance the changes set afoot by institutes already taught. Others will promote changes which cannot now be predicted which can occur only when the possibilities opened by the institutes of 1962 and 1965 have been fully realized.

## THE PILOT STUDY: SUMMARY AND PROSPECTUS

The conclusions about the achievements and promises of the institutes of 1965 are also conclusions about the achievements and promises of the Pilot Study. The study has shown that it is possible, using the means it employed, to learn something relatively secure and variously useful about what institutes have done and can do. The discoveries and defects of the study also suggest certain ways in which future studies can be differently designed to be more efficient and useful.

It is not clear, for one thing, that much is to be gained by studying institutes for the purpose of evaluating them, or even that it is possible usefully to evaluate them in a study like this one. The judgments of participants and members of the staffs are valuable as a kind of reverberation of the earnest and excited tone which pervades institutes and which presumably expresses the present attitude of many teachers toward the ideas institutes are intended to broadcast. It is also useful to commission the opinions of experienced and thoughtful teachers who will visit institutes, suggest why one or another of them is more or less effective, and speculate on institutes in general. But it is a most doubtful practice to accept any of these judgments as anything more than partial and suggestive. In the first place, the judgments of visitors, participants, and members of the staffs do not always agree. For example, one institute which an evaluator found unadventurously conceived and conducted with a stifling air of routine was described by 78% of its participants (compare 55.5% for all institutes) as an "Exhilarating experience throughout" and by 82% of them (58.8% for all institutes) as "Extremely useful" in helping them meet the problems of their own teaching. Another institute whose cogency and pace greatly impressed the visitor was rather more coldly judged by its participants, 70% of whom thought it only "Somewhat useful" (only 38.6% of the participants in all institutes were this guarded in their approval), 60% of whom thought it had met their most vexing problem in teaching only "To a moderate degree" (43.8% for all institutes), and 66.7% of whom thought it only "Occasionally stimulating" (36.8% for all institutes).

It is proper to add that in other instances the evaluations of the visitors and participants more nearly coincided. After consulting the information and opinions of evaluators, participants, and directors, it is possible to estimate with some certainty the measure of effectiveness achieved in seven of the nine institutes for which all this data has been collected. But even then, it is hard to see the utility of such estimates. They do nothing to enlarge the effectiveness of the institute, which is completed, or to educate the participants, who have dispersed. They perhaps educate the members of the staffs in their shortcomings and so prepare them to do better a second time. But however instructive an evaluator's report or the remarks of participants may be to those who taught in a particular institute, a report such as this one -- which must if it is to justify its preparation trade in generalizations drawn from the activities of many institutes -- is not likely to offer any advice more useful than those observations already recorded that effective institutes seem to have worked all their components into a rhythm and coherence which gave them an identity of their own. An evaluation of an individual institute, in short, comes too late to be of any service, and an evaluation of a number of institutes is likely to be too general to serve as anything but a description of the ends to which well-conducted institutes should aspire, rather than as tight and specific recommendations of the means by which these ends may be realized.

Future studies can, therefore, more profitably be reports about what happened in the institutes of a particular summer, how the idea of institutes is growing into new patterns and attempting new purposes, which patterns seem of special promise and which have exhausted their promise, how the proliferation and effects of institutes are changing the problems of the teaching of English they were inaugurated to meet, and whether the ideas set out in institutes are changing the teaching of English in the colleges and universities which educate the teachers. A principal conclusion of this study is that institutes like those taught to teachers of English in the summer of 1965 are a different kind of education which can generate decisive changes in how people teach, how they define their subject, and how they define and accept their responsibilities for the effectiveness with which it is taught. To describe the assumptions, intentions, and activities of institutes is to amplify these effects. Future studies of institutes ought to undertake such descriptions, ought to judge only to inform, ought to evaluate only to promote the promising and to discourage the unnecessary. Future studies can most usefully be not judgments by some teachers of how a great many others are faring, but a series of contemporary reports to all teachers of English about how the teaching of English is changing.

Further, the real effectiveness of institutes can only be measured by changes which begin after the summer is over. Future studies ought therefore to follow the participants and members of the staffs of the institutes into their own classrooms to learn -- six months later, a year later, two years later -- exactly how they have changed the content, ways, and purposes of their teaching and how succeeding generations of students improve their grasp of spoken and written English. Again, the service of these discoveries is not to the institute in which the teachers taught or were taught. For better or for worse, the institute is over, even though to pursue those who took part in it may revive and enlarge some of its effects. But the dominant purpose of this canvass of effects ought to be to instruct teachers of teachers, in institutes and in the established curricula, of means of instruction which seem to be effective, and of needs which no instruction has yet reached.

It is proposed, therefore, that several means be adopted to survey institutes in English, and to assure that the benefits are sustained and amplified after an individual institute itself disbands. First, much of the information collected by the questionnaires of the Pilot Study could be collected more efficiently on a response sheet returned to the Office of Education by each applicant for admission to an institute. Information about the participant's age, sex, education, experience, and where and what he teaches is the same before he comes to the institute as it is after he completes it, and it need not therefore be gathered with other information about the experience of the institute itself. Similar information can usefully be collected by the U. S. Office about the faculties of the institutes, so that a record will be available of the characteristics of those who teach in the institutes.

After the institutes have begun, a carefully selected sample of participants and faculty should be asked to complete a second questionnaire. This questionnaire should be written by a teacher of English in collaboration with a specialist in the methods of statistical surveys and measurements. The questionnaire should be written after both authors have read the proposals of the institutes to be taught during the summer. The questions ought to be designed to elicit opinions about the institutes and, so far as possible, to step beyond superficiality into the motives and expectations of those who attend and teach in the institutes. The participants and members of the faculties should also be asked to specify the changes which, while the institute is still in session, they think will be effected in their teaching. These same participants and faculty members should be asked to complete another questionnaire at least six months later, in which they would again be asked their opinions about the institute. But, more important, they would also be asked to specify again, the changes they think the institute has effected in their own teaching. This second questionnaire ought not be written until the responses to the first one have been tabulated and studied. The second questionnaire would therefore primarily seek to discover more about those matters and possibilities which the responses to the first questionnaire suggest are peculiarly important and interesting.

During their terms some of the institutes which enroll the participants in the sample should be visited by one or two visitors. The value of the visitor is that, although he sees only a part of the truth, the part he sees is both important and closed to everyone else. Unlike the director and the other people in the institute, he easily sees around it because he sees it in context of all he has seen in other institutes and all he knows and thinks of institutes in general. And unlike even the most cunningly designed questionnaire, he sees into an institute with an acuity unavailable to anyone who has not lived for several days in the rhythms and tones of its day to day life.

Each institute visited should be observed by a college or secondary school teachers of English for at least three days. During at least one of those three days he should be joined by a second visitor who is not a teacher of English but who knows a good deal about education, learning, language, or the uses of language -- a psychologist, a linguist, a sociologist, a journalist, a poet, a school administrator not primarily responsible for the teaching of English, a union official or corporation executive responsible for training people to perform complicated jobs. The visitors should during their stay try especially to estimate not the effectiveness of the institute, but the nature and intensity of its participants' responses to it and hopes from it. Each visitor should observe at least three different institutes, alike in their designs and purposes but taught in different kinds of schools. Each visitor should submit a report addressed to the topics considered in the questionnaires. Each should also review the tabulations of the responses to the questionnaires and write another short report in which he discusses, on the basis of his visit to the concrete realities which lie below the statistics, the significance and validity of the data collected by the questionnaires.

There are two purposes to be served by the procedures just described. The first is simply to learn and report generally what the institutes of any year are doing. The information returned by applicants will describe who wants to attend institutes as well as who is attending them. The opinions and responses solicited by the questionnaires completed by the participants and members of the faculties during and after the term of the institute will specify the motives, expectations, and effects on the people actually involved in the institutes. The reports of the visitors will give substance to the courses, teachers, participants, purposes, particular achievements, and unique qualities of individual institutes, through which the more general information of the questionnaires can be interpreted.

The end of all this information would be a report like the present one. The report will be more sophisticated and complete because it will be based on some very close questions about who attends and wants to attend institutes, and on some subtle questions about why they attend and how their teaching is changed. Its conclusions will be more authoritative because its visitors will have observed more different kinds of institutes and because the participants in the institutes will have been followed into their own classrooms. But its purpose will fundamentally be that which the Pilot Study has pointed up: to broadcast the achievements, inadequacies, and promises of the institutes just completed so that those about to begin can move out more surely or provocatively from where their predecessors stood.

The second purpose of such studies is not necessarily exclusive of the first. The authors of future questionnaires and the planners of future visits could decide to study a single topic which seems to be of especial interest or potency. This study could be accommodated within a general survey. If its designers chose, for example, to study the means and ends of the teaching of composition or language in the institutes, they need merely to arrange that a good deal of information be collected on this topic while other information was being collected about the institutes in which language and composition were being taught. But the benefits of a general survey might have to be foregone if in any year it were decided to study, say, the peculiar value of those institutes which have enlisted the talents and knowledge of teachers in other disciplines, or to estimate the success and promise of those few institutes each year which are deliberately experimental, or to survey the effects, after two or three years, of institutes on the curricula of a half dozen colleges and universities which have had them for several year.

The choice between a general study and a study of a single topic need not be made now. Nor can the procedures and logistics of either kind of study be specified here, for they will vary with what the year's allotment of institutes seems to make profitable and appropriate.

It is in considering the purpose of such surveys that the Pilot Study has come to a conclusion different from the premise with which it began. It began as a study to define criteria for evaluating NDEA institutes in English. It here ends with the recommendation that such studies ought not so much to evaluate as to propagate, ought to describe not so much to judge the effectiveness of institutes as to advertise and extend their effects. Whether future studies survey the general range and possibilities of institutes, or whether they concentrate on the forward edge, they should properly try to summarize what has been done only to help create what needs next to be done.

## NOTES

[1] The National Interest and the Teaching of English (Champaign, 1961); and John Gerber, The Evaluation of the 1962 English Institutes (New York,1964). On the aims and achievements of the CEEB institutes of 1962, see also Freedom and Discipline in English (New York, 1965).

[2] The members of the committee which planned the Pilot Study were: John H. Fisher, Executive Secretary of the Modern Language Association; Floyd Rinker, Executive Director of the Commission on English; Eugene E. Slaughter, of Southeastern State College, Durant, Oklahoma, and presently of the United States Office of Education; James R. Squire, Executive Secretary of the National Council of Teachers of English; and William Work, Executive Secretary of the Speech Association of America.

[3] The director of the Pilot Study was Donald J. Gray, of the Department of English of Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana. The associate director was Craig Swauger, of the Department of English of Indiana State College, Indiana, Pennsylvania. The evaluators were John Fisher, Floyd Rinker, James Squire, Donald Gray, Richard Corbin, of the Department of English at Hunter College High School, New York City then president of the National Council of Teachers of English; the late Frederick L. Gwynn, of the Department of English at Trinity College, Hartford, Connecticut; and John Maxwell, consultant in English of the Minneapolis City Schools. Those who attended either the June or September meetings of the committee which conducted the Pilot Study were: Charlotte Browne-Mayers, Director of Adult Education Activities, Standard Oil Company (New Jersey); Christine Gibson, of the Graduate School of Education, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts; John B. Carroll, of the Laboratory for Research in Instruction at Harvard University; William Jovanovich, president of Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc.; Eric Larrabee, New York City; John B. Shallenberger, president, Connellsville Corporation; W. D. Snodgrass, of Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan; and Julian Street, Jr., Staff Director, Educational Services, U. S. Steel Corporation. In addition, the following persons served as consultants to the committee: George L. Anderson, Michael F. Shugrue, and Donald D. Walsh, of the Modern Language Association; Donald M. Bigelow, D. Lee Hamilton, and Arno Jewett, of the United States Office of Education; and James W. Brown, of San Jose State College, San Jose, California, the director of the project to evaluate NDEA institutes in educational media.

[4] Some of Professor Cox's conclusions are put forward in the report of the Educational Media Institute Evaluation Project, published in 1965 by EMIE, 434 East William Street, San Jose, California. See especially Chapter 6, pp. 1-7 of the EMIE report. See also Appendix E of the Pilot Study for further remarks on the use of new material and media in the institutes in English.

# APPENDIX A

## Item Tabulations of Responses to Participant Questionnaires and to Director-Staff Questionnaires

# ITEM TABULATION

## NDEA ENGLISH INSTITUTES -- 1965 PARTICIPANT QUESTIONNAIRE

Following are tabulations for 75 items of the Participant Questionnaire administered to participants in the 1965 NDEA Summer Institutes in English. The items are worded as they were on the questionnaire each participant returned.

Questionnaires were mailed to 103 English Institutes in July. All but one Institute returned completed questionnaires. A total of 4,185 participants in 102 Institutes completed questionnaires. It is estimated that the 4,185 responses represent about 95 per cent of the participants engaged in the 1965 NDEA Summer Institutes in English.

Explanation of "No Response" tabulations: In instances where respondents failed to answer a question clearly applicable to all participants, the No Response tabulation is shown as a part of the 100 per cent total. However, for questions which did not apply to all participants the number of No Responses is not included in the 100 per cent total. It is clear that in the latter cases some participants failed to answer questions that applied to them. However, for more meaningful comparisons only those responding are grouped in the 100 per cent total.

### General Information

1. Classification of Institute

| | No. | Pct. |
|---|---|---|
| S-1 | 162 | 3.9 |
| S-2 | 2436 | 58.2 |
| S-3 | 1111 | 26.5 |
| E-1 | 12 | .3 |
| E-2 | 284 | 6.8 |
| E-3 | 1 | .0 |
| No Response | 179 | 4.3 |
| | 4185 | 100.0 |

2. Type of Institute

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| General | 2792 | 66.7 |
| Special | 1366 | 32.6 |
| No Response | 27 | .7 |
| | 4185 | 100.0 |

3. If Special, indicate kind

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Literature | 115 | 8.6 |
| Literature-Composition | 166 | 12.4 |
| Linguistics | 226 | 16.8 |
| Composition | 234 | 17.7 |
| Linguistics-Composition | 440 | 32.9 |
| Other | 155 | 11.6 |
| No Response - 2849 | 1336 | 100.0 |

4. Length of Institute

| | No. | Pct. |
|---|---|---|
| 3 weeks | 231 | 5.5 |
| 4 weeks | 0 | .0 |
| 5 weeks | 20 | .5 |
| 6 weeks | 1798 | 43.0 |
| 7 weeks | 709 | 16.9 |
| 8 weeks | 1414 | 33.8 |
| No Response | 13 | .3 |
| | 4185 | 100.0 |

5. Number of participants completing Institute

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 25-29 | 215 | 5.1 |
| 30-39 | 956 | 22.8 |
| 40-49 | 2042 | 48.8 |
| 50 or more | 954 | 22.8 |
| No Response | 18 | .5 |
| | 4185 | 100.0 |

6. Age of participants

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Under 25 | 237 | 5.7 |
| 25-34 | 1709 | 40.8 |
| 35-44 | 1271 | 30.4 |
| 45-54 | 777 | 18.6 |
| 55 or more | 149 | 3.5 |
| No Response | 42 | 1.0 |
| | 4185 | 100.0 |

7. Sex of participants

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Male | 1874 | 44.8 |
| Female | 2283 | 54.6 |
| No Response | 28 | .6 |
| | 4185 | 100.0 |

8. Number of undergraduate credits in English (semester hours completed prior to the Institute). Include here such basic courses as Freshman English, speech, and introduction to literature.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 17 or fewer | 427 | 10.2 |
| 18-23 | 740 | 17.7 |
| 24-35 | 1409 | 33.7 |
| 36 or more | 1575 | 37.6 |
| No Response | 34 | .8 |
| | 4185 | 100.0 |

9. Number of graduate credits in English (semester hours completed prior to Institute). Do _not_ include courses in departments other than English except linguistics and comparative literature.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| None | 1677 | 40.1 |
| 1-10 | 1182 | 28.2 |
| 11-20 | 594 | 14.2 |
| 21-30 | 381 | 9.1 |
| 31 or more | 299 | 7.1 |
| No Response | 52 | 1.3 |
| | 4185 | 100.0 |

10. Number of credits (graduate or undergraduate prior to Institute) in other departments which deal specifically with aspects of teaching of English, i.e., children's literature, speech, language arts, teaching of reading, methods in English, language learning.

| | No. | Pct. |
|---|---|---|
| None | 644 | 15.4 |
| 2-12 | 1987 | 47.5 |
| 13-20 | 732 | 17.5 |
| 21-30 | 422 | 10.1 |
| 31 or more | 332 | 7.9 |
| No Response | 67 | 1.6 |
| | 4185 | 100.0 |

11. Years of service as an English teacher.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1.0- 1.9 | 192 | 4.6 |
| 2.0- 2.9 | 302 | 7.2 |
| 3.0- 4.9 | 856 | 20.5 |
| 5.0- 9.9 | 1417 | 33.9 |
| 10.0-14.9 | 728 | 17.4 |
| 15.0-19.9 | 375 | 9.0 |
| 20.0-24.9 | 170 | 4.1 |
| 25.0-29.9 | 81 | 1.9 |
| 30 or more | 46 | 1.1 |
| No Response | 18 | .3 |
| | 4185 | 100.0 |

12. Indicate in what grades you teach English (Language Arts).

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Primary (Grades 1-2-3) | 94 | 2.2 |
| Intermediate (Grades 4-5-6) | 200 | 4.8 |
| Only junior high | 977 | 23.3 |
| Only senior high | 2348 | 56.2 |
| Both junior and senior high | 528 | 12.6 |
| No Response | 38 | .9 |
| | 4185 | 100.0 |

13. Are you presently a member of the National Council of Teachers of English?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Yes | 1909 | 45.6 |
| No | 2230 | 53.3 |
| No Response | 46 | 1.1 |
| | 4185 | 100.0 |

Appraisal of Institute

14. How useful has the Institute been in preparing you to handle your own teaching situations, your own students?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Extremely useful | 2460 | 58.8 |
| Somewhat useful | 1619 | 38.6 |
| Not at all useful | 53 | 1.3 |
| No Response | 53 | 1.3 |
| | 4185 | 100.0 |

15-18. If you took the Literature course (and the related activities in the Workshop), respond to the next four items by ranking them in what you judge to be the order of their value to you . . . Rank each item from 1 to 4 and do not use the same rank twice.

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | NR |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 15. Knowledge and techniques of close reading of a literary work | 1423 | 919 | 502 | 298 | 1043 |
| 16. Varied approaches to the study of a literary work | 811 | 993 | 990 | 350 | 1041 |
| 17. Acquaintance with literature and writers new to participants | 562 | 539 | 690 | 1353 | 1041 |
| 18. New techniques in reading and presenting specific genres | 349 | 694 | 959 | 1135 | 1048 |

Sum of ranks procedure indicates participants showed preference for 15, a second preference for 16, with almost no distinction between 17 and 18.

19-22. If you took the Language course (and related activities in the Workshop), respond to the next four items by ranking them in what you judge to be the order of their value to you . . . Rank each item from 1 to 4 and do not use the same rank twice.

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | NR |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 19. Awareness of language as a field of study | 1520 | 888 | 501 | 642 | 642 |
| 20. Knowledge and appreciation of the current grammars | 1378 | 1124 | 665 | 383 | 635 |
| 21. Practical applications to the classroom | 246 | 549 | 1085 | 1667 | 638 |
| 22. Better understanding of usage problems | 413 | 987 | 1294 | 854 | 637 |

Sum of ranks procedure indicates participants showed slight preference for 20 over 19, with 22 ranked third and 21 ranked fourth.

23-26. If you took the Composition course (and the related activities in the Workshop), respond to the next four items by ranking them in what you judge to be the order of their value to you . . . Rank each item from 1 to 4 and do not use the same rank twice.

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | NR |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 23. Participants' own improved writing skills | 1083 | 763 | 702 | 1051 | 586 |
| 24. Better evaluation of student writing | 577 | 1145 | 1197 | 680 | 586 |
| 25. Ways to evoke good writing from students | 908 | 1004 | 953 | 733 | 587 |
| 26. Knowledge of rhetorical principles | 1029 | 688 | 740 | 1138 | 589 |

Sums of ranks procedure indicates participants showed preference for 25, a second preference for 23, with no distinction between 24 and 26.

27-30. If you participated in a Workshop, respond to the next four items by ranking them in what you judge to be the order of their value to you . . . Rank each item from 1 to 4 and do not use the same rank twice.

| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | NR |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 27. | Completed projects to be used in own classroom | 785 | 468 | 478 | 1499 | 955 |
| 28. | Acquaintance with experimental curricular materials and new textbooks | 1101 | 714 | 796 | 630 | 944 |
| 29. | Techniques in integrating subject matter of Institute's course work | 742 | 1187 | 881 | 419 | 956 |
| 30. | Transfer of theory to practical work | 616 | 861 | 1066 | 684 | 958 |

Sums of ranks procedure indicates almost no preference between 28 and 29, with 30 ranked third and 27 ranked fourth.

31. If you took the Literature course, check the one item below which best describes an aspect of the course on which you would have preferred to spend more time.

| | No. | Pct. |
|---|---|---|
| Close reading of a literary work | 431 | 13.7 |
| Critical approaches in addition to analytical | 600 | 19.1 |
| Use of bibliographies and of critical works | 135 | 4.2 |
| Class discussion of literary works | 541 | 17.2 |
| Techniques used by writers - point of view, irony, symbol, paradox, etc. | 786 | 24.9 |
| None of above | 660 | 20.9 |
| No Responses - 1032 | 3153 | 100.0 |

32. If you took the Language course, check the one item below which best describes an aspect of the course on which you would have preferred to spend more time.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| History of the English language | 585 | 16.3 |
| Varieties of language and usage | 639 | 17.7 |
| Theory of phonology | 212 | 5.9 |
| Syntax | 818 | 22.7 |
| Different grammar systems | 874 | 24.3 |
| None of above | 469 | 13.0 |
| No Response - 588 | 3597 | 100.0 |

33. If you took the Composition course, check the one item below which best describes an aspect of the course on which you would have preferred to spend more time.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Criticism of their own writing | 802 | 21.9 |
| More writing assignments | 254 | 6.9 |
| Instructor-participant conferences | 634 | 17.3 |
| Study of models of good writing | 919 | 25.1 |
| Oral composition | 261 | 7.1 |
| None of above | 797 | 21.7 |
| No Response - 518 | 3667 | 100.0 |

34. If you participated in a Workshop, check the one item below which best describes an aspect of the Workshop on which you would have preferred to spend more time.

| | No. | Pct. |
|---|---|---|
| Preparing practical materials for classroom use | 1233 | 36.1 |
| Audio-visual aids | 169 | 4.9 |
| More actual time in workshop | 258 | 7.6 |
| Attention to materials available to teachers | 578 | 16.9 |
| Evaluation of classroom instruction | 638 | 18.7 |
| None of above | 541 | 15.8 |
| No Response - 768 | 3417 | 100.0 |

35. As a direct outcome of this Institute you may now be looking ahead to making changes in your own teaching materials or practices. Please check the one item which would be the most significant change in your teaching procedures as a result of your having taken the course in Literature (and the related work in the Workshop). Since this question is designed to measure the impact of the work of the Institute, check only that item which represents a change or an innovation in your teaching and not that which had been a part of your teaching prior to the Institute.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| More emphasis on close reading of literature | 1204 | 36.8 |
| Integration of literature and composition assignments | 961 | 29.4 |
| Additional use of paperbacks | 297 | 9.0 |
| Changes in textbooks | 92 | 2.8 |
| Introduction of literature studied in Institute | 379 | 11.8 |
| None of above | 335 | 10.2 |
| No Response - 917 | 3268 | 100.0 |

36. Following directions of question No. 35, please check the one item below which would be the most significant change in your teaching procedures as a result of your having taken the course in Language (and the related work of the Workshop).

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Use of the terminology of structural grammar | 369 | 10.3 |
| Units on the history of the language, levels of usage, dictionary study, local dialects, etc. | 966 | 26.7 |
| Stress on sentence instead of parts of speech | 1003 | 27.8 |
| Consideration of other methods of sentence analysis than diagramming | 508 | 14.1 |
| Consideration of language in communication - symbolic, logic, semantics, etc. | 518 | 14.3 |
| None of above | 247 | 6.8 |
| No Response - 574 | 3611 | 100.0 |

37. Following the directions of question No. 35, please check the one item below which would be the most significant change in your teaching procedures as a result of your having taken the course in Composition (and the related work in the Workshop).

| | No. | Pct. |
|---|---|---|
| Generally more emphasis on composition, with shorter and more frequent papers | 1328 | 35.8 |
| More class discussion of students' writing, with close analysis | 1504 | 40.5 |
| Use of models of composition | 420 | 11.3 |
| More attention to oral composition | 86 | 2.3 |
| Provide earlier school writing opportunities | 118 | 3.2 |
| None of above | 255 | 6.9 |
| No Response - 474 | 3711 | 100.0 |

38. Place a check mark in front of the one item below which you feel best describes a principal weakness of the Literature course.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Emphasis on close analysis as the only really acceptable critical approach | 267 | 8.2 |
| Instructor's own interpretations consumed too much class time | 457 | 14.3 |
| Little or no integration of literature and composition in written assignments | 240 | 7.4 |
| One genre given excessive attention | 205 | 6.3 |
| None of above | 2066 | 63.8 |
| No Response - 950 | 3235 | 100.0 |

39. Place a check mark in front of the one item below which you feel best describes a principal weakness of the Language course.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Overburden of technical detail | 817 | 22.8 |
| Strong bias on part of instructor in presenting various grammars | 139 | 3.8 |
| Entry point into material too advanced | 687 | 19.2 |
| Entry point into material insufficiently advanced | 226 | 6.4 |
| None of above | 1743 | 47.8 |
| No Response - 573 | 3612 | 100.0 |

40. Place a check mark in front of the one item below which you feel best describes a principal weakness of the Composition course.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Work not difficult enough for advanced writing class | 97 | 2.5 |
| Absence of integrated writing assignments | 342 | 9.2 |
| Excessive number of writing assignments | 403 | 10.7 |
| Inadequate number of personal conferences with instructor | 614 | 17.0 |
| None of above | 2245 | 60.6 |
| No Response - 484 | 3701 | 100.0 |

41. Place a check mark in front of the one item which you feel best describes a principal weakness of the Workshop phase of the Institute.

| | No. | Pct. |
|---|---|---|
| Insufficient materials, texts, films, etc. | 167 | 4.9 |
| No clear guidance in the work of the workshop by the supervisor | 708 | 20.5 |
| Workshop supervisor did not seem to understand day-to-day practical problems of English teaching below college level | 290 | 8.4 |
| Workshop failed to differentiate between junior and senior high school teaching | 206 | 5.9 |
| None of above | 2075 | 60.3 |
| No Response - 739 | 3446 | 100.0 |

42. Check the one item which you feel best describes the instructor of the course in Literature.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Used fresh and stimulating material | 942 | 29.0 |
| Organized presentations carefully | 947 | 29.0 |
| Maintained rapport between himself and class | 601 | 18.6 |
| Was available for consultation | 150 | 4.6 |
| Showed understanding of problems and practices of English teaching below the college level | 228 | 7.7 |
| None of above | 358 | 11.1 |
| No Response - 959 | 3226 | 100.0 |

43. Check the one item which you feel best describes the instructor of the course in Language.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Used fresh and stimulating material | 788 | 21.8 |
| Organized presentations carefully | 672 | 18.2 |
| Maintained rapport between himself and class | 630 | 17.7 |
| Was available for consultation | 344 | 9.7 |
| Showed understanding of problems and practices of English teaching below the college level | 590 | 16.6 |
| None of above | 537 | 16.0 |
| No Response - 624 | 3561 | 100.0 |

44. Check the one item which you feel best describes the instructor of the course in Composition.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Used fresh and stimulating material | 788 | 21.5 |
| Organized presentations carefully | 655 | 18.1 |
| Maintained rapport between himself and class | 490 | 13.4 |
| Was available for consultation | 413 | 11.3 |
| Showed understanding of problems and practices of English teaching below the college level | 802 | 22.4 |
| None of above | 486 | 13.3 |
| No Response - 551 | 3634 | 100.0 |

45. Check the one item which describes the most useful activity carried out in the Workshop phase of your Institute.

| | No. | Pct. |
|---|---|---|
| Providing criteria for the selection of materials | 551 | 16.0 |
| Counseling on individual projects | 343 | 9.9 |
| Developing sequential programs | 307 | 8.8 |
| Preparing teaching plans, such as integrated thematic units | 608 | 17.6 |
| Making extensive use of experimental curricular materials | 540 | 15.6 |
| None of above | 1106 | 32.1 |
| No Response - 730 | 3455 | 100.0 |

46. Certain resource materials may have been introduced into the discussion, demonstration, or study of the Workshop phase of your Institute. Check the one item below which was a part of your Workshop and which would be most useful in your teaching.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Overhead projector and transparencies | 1047 | 28.8 |
| Prerecorded audio tapes | 132 | 3.6 |
| Programmed learning | 183 | 5.0 |
| Opaque projector | 117 | 3.2 |
| Instructional films and filmstrips | 725 | 20.1 |
| Self-contained audio or visual units | 73 | 2.1 |
| Educational television | 38 | 1.0 |
| None of above | 1303 | 36.2 |
| No Response - 567 | 3618 | 100.0 |

47. In relation to your own teaching situation, do you feel the activities of the Workshop to be

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Introductory to long-range benefits | 522 | 14.8 |
| Of immediate benefit | 408 | 11.6 |
| Combination of the above two | 1803 | 50.9 |
| Of benefit vaguely in the future | 789 | 22.7 |
| No Response - 663 | 3522 | 100.0 |

48-59. Some Project English experimental curricular materials were made available to your Institute. For each of the materials shown below by project centers, check the appropriate space . . . as an indication of the extent to which the materials were used in your Institute and of the usefulness of the materials for your purpose. If materials from some centers were not available in your Institute, check the box under "Materials Not Used."

| | Materials Not Used | | Materials Used But Not Helpful | | Materials Helpful | | No Response | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. |
| 48. Carnegie Tech (social, grammar, success, dictionaries, tragedy, Middle English) | 2473 | 59.1 | 197 | 4.7 | 968 | 23.1 | 547 | 13.1 |
| 49. Florida State (myth, modern, nature, adolescents, cognition) | 2631 | 62.8 | 266 | 6.4 | 711 | 17.0 | 577 | 13.8 |
| 50. Gallaudet (structure, composition) | 2867 | 68.5 | 217 | 5.2 | 421 | 10.1 | 680 | 16.2 |
| 51. Georgia (language, composing) | 2562 | 61.2 | 255 | 6.1 | 703 | 16.8 | 665 | 15.9 |
| 52. Hunter (family, verse stories, self-identification, reading, book list) | 2827 | 67.6 | 205 | 4.9 | 480 | 11.5 | 673 | 16.0 |
| 53. Illinois (qualifications) | 2402 | 57.4 | 369 | 8.8 | 777 | 18.6 | 637 | 15.2 |
| 54. Nebraska (fable, satire, words, syntax, rhetoric, elementary) | 1505 | 36.0 | 382 | 9.0 | 1869 | 44.7 | 429 | 10.3 |
| 55. Northwestern (composition) | 2011 | 48.1 | 256 | 6.1 | 1362 | 32.5 | 556 | 13.3 |
| 56. Oregon (structure, travel, Steinbeck, London, speech, rhetoric) | 1611 | 38.5 | 357 | 8.5 | 1822 | 43.5 | 395 | 9.5 |
| 57. Western Reserve (semantics, animal, environment, courage, symbolism, power, satire, survival, outcast, culture, protest, hero) | 2362 | 56.4 | 265 | 6.3 | 983 | 23.5 | 575 | 13.8 |
| 58. Wisconsin (teaching literature) | 2447 | 58.5 | 172 | 4.1 | 938 | 22.4 | 628 | 15.0 |
| 59. U. S. Office of Education (research projects) | 2380 | 56.9 | 198 | 4.7 | 952 | 22.7 | 655 | 15.7 |

60. Did your Institute have a separate library, one exclusively for the use of the participants?

| | No. | Pct. |
|---|---|---|
| Yes | 3607 | 86.2 |
| No | 550 | 13.1 |
| No Response | 28 | .7 |
| | 4185 | 100.0 |

61. To what degree were the materials in the library, whether separate or not, useful to you in your Institute studies?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| To a great degree | 2102 | 50.2 |
| To a moderate degree | 1561 | 37.3 |
| To a little degree | 473 | 11.3 |
| No Response | 49 | 1.2 |
| | 4185 | 100.0 |

62. To what degree did the materials of the library give you an opportunity to examine new materials for your classroom?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| To a great degree | 1910 | 45.6 |
| To a moderate degree | 1555 | 37.2 |
| To a little degree | 658 | 15.7 |
| No Response | 62 | 1.5 |
| | 4185 | 100.0 |

63-65. The use of a variety of films was intended to be a significant phase of the Institute. Please react to the use made of films in your Institute by checking appropriate items in the questions below.

63. How relevant was the content of the films to work of the Institute?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Relevant | 2425 | 57.9 |
| Relevant at times | 1177 | 28.2 |
| Not relevant | 197 | 4.7 |
| No Response | 386 | 9.2 |
| | 4185 | 100.0 |

64. How extensively were participants prepared by the staff for the showing of the films?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Considerable preparation | 1315 | 31.4 |
| Limited preparation | 2004 | 47.9 |
| None | 424 | 10.1 |
| No Response | 442 | 10.6 |
| | 4185 | 100.0 |

65. How adequate was follow-up discussion of the content of the films?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Adequate | 1760 | 42.1 |
| Limited | 1453 | 34.7 |
| None | 531 | 12.7 |
| No Response | 441 | 10.5 |
| | 4185 | 100.0 |

66. In view of the fact that considerable reading is required for the Institute, check the one item below which you feel would have been most valuable having in advance of the Institute.

| | No. | Pct. |
|---|---|---|
| Reading list for courses and workshop | 1242 | 29.7 |
| Selected books to be read as preparation for Institute | 2067 | 49.4 |
| Duplicated materials used in workshop | 234 | 5.6 |
| None | 570 | 13.6 |
| No Response | 72 | 1.7 |
| | 4185 | 100.0 |

67. In view of the purposes and program of the Institute in which you are enrolled, what is your opinion of the length of the Institute?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Should be longer | 662 | 15.8 |
| About the right length | 3051 | 72.9 |
| Should be shorter | 453 | 10.8 |
| No Response | 19 | .5 |
| | 4185 | 100.0 |

68. Evaluate the contribution made by the visiting specialist(s).

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Clearly relevant to the organized program | 1994 | 51.3 |
| Supplementary to the Institute program | 1494 | 38.4 |
| Only vaguely relevant to the program | 401 | 10.3 |
| No Response - 296 | 3889 | 100.0 |

69. Check the one item below which described the most useful additional activity of any of the visiting specialists.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Participated in smaller group sessions | 297 | 7.6 |
| Met informally with participants | 893 | 23.1 |
| Conducted question and answer sessions | 1989 | 51.1 |
| None of above | 705 | 18.2 |
| No Response - 301 | 3884 | 100.0 |

70. During the Institute experience you have been involved in informal meetings, conversations, and coffee breaks; you have lived, eaten and worked together, sharing ideas and experiences with other English teachers. How useful have you found this kind of professional association?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Extremely useful | 2632 | 62.9 |
| Useful | 1079 | 25.8 |
| Moderately useful | 360 | 8.6 |
| Of little use | 83 | 2.0 |
| No Response | 31 | .7 |
| | 4185 | 100.0 |

71. Since the academic program of an Institute is demanding, some planned social activities (receptions, picnics, dinners) extracurricular events (lectures, theatre, sports) for the participants seemed appropriate, even necessary. Check the item below which most describes the social and extracurricular life of your Institute.

| | No. | Pct. |
|---|---|---|
| Just about right | 2942 | 70.3 |
| Too much emphasis | 105 | 2.5 |
| Not enough | 1067 | 25.5 |
| No Response | 71 | 1.7 |
| | 4185 | 100.0 |

72. What is your feeling about the total work load of the Institute?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Much too heavy | 521 | 12.4 |
| Too heavy | 1609 | 38.4 |
| About right | 1942 | 46.4 |
| Too light | 80 | 1.9 |
| No Response | 33 | .9 |
| | 4185 | 100.0 |

73. Check the one teaching problem that most vexed you as a teacher before enrolling in the Institute.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Motivating students | 338 | 8.1 |
| Handling low reading ability of students | 385 | 9.2 |
| Coping with your own lack of background in literature, language, and composition | 1104 | 26.4 |
| Meeting individual differences | 393 | 9.4 |
| Determining what is significant to teach | 953 | 22.8 |
| Using effective teaching methods | 386 | 9.2 |
| Finding and using appropriate materials | 327 | 7.8 |
| Evaluating student achievement | 261 | 6.2 |
| No Response | 38 | .9 |
| | 4185 | 100.0 |

74. To what degree did the Institute meet the problem checked above?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| To a great degree | 1868 | 44.6 |
| To a moderate degree | 1834 | 43.8 |
| Not at all | 448 | 10.7 |
| No Response | 35 | .9 |
| | 4185 | 100.0 |

75. Keeping in mind that the advanced study of the Institute was designed to improve your effectiveness as a teacher and to create renewed enthusiasm for your work, check the item below which best describes the Institute experience for you.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Exhilarating experience throughout | 2320 | 55.5 |
| Occasionally stimulating | 1542 | 36.8 |
| No different from usual institute study | 58 | 1.4 |
| Generally disappointing | 228 | 5.4 |
| No Response | 37 | .9 |
| | 4185 | 100.0 |

## Free Response

Please feel free to comment briefly on either or both of the following.

1. To what extent has your work in the Institute prepared you to take an active part in the revitalizing and upgrading of English teaching? Comment on how you believe the members of this Institute can best make use of their training in their own classrooms and their own school programs.

2. Comment on how you think future Institutes can best serve the English teacher.

(See APPENDIX C)

# ITEM TABULATION

## NDEA ENGLISH INSTITUTES -- 1965 DIRECTOR-STAFF QUESTIONNAIRE

Following are tabulations for 75 items of the Director-Staff Questionnaire completed by directors and other staff members in the 1965 NDEA Summer Institutes in English. The items are worded as they were on the questionnaire each director and staff member returned.

Questionnaires were mailed to the 103 English Institutes in July. All but one Institute returned completed questionnaires. A total of 490 staff members in 102 Institutes completed questionnaires.

Questions which are preceded by a (D) were to be answered by the director only, those by an (I) by an instructor only, and those by a (W) by the workshop supervisor only. The results show that in some instances instructors and workshop supervisors answered questions indicated for directors only.

Explanation of "No Response" tabulations: In instances where respondents failed to answer a question clearly applicable to all staff members, the No Response tabulation is shown as a part of the 100 per cent total. However, for questions which did not apply to all staff members the number of No Responses is not included in the 100 per cent total. It is clear that in the latter cases some staff members failed to answer questions that applied to them. However, for more meaningful comparisons only those responding are grouped in the 100 per cent total.

(D-I-W) 1. Classification of Institute

| | No. | Pct. |
|---|---|---|
| S-1 | 12 | 2.4 |
| S-2 | 271 | 55.3 |
| S-3 | 110 | 22.4 |
| E-1 | 0 | 0 |
| E-2 | 21 | 4.3 |
| E-3 | 0 | 0 |
| S-2 and S-3 | 20 | 4.2 |
| S-1 and S-2 | 0 | 0 |
| E and S | 8 | 1.6 |
| No Response | 48 | 9.8 |
| | 490 | 100.0 |

(D-I-W) 2. Type of Institute

| | No. | Pct. |
|---|---|---|
| General | 331 | 67.5 |
| Special | 146 | 29.8 |
| No Response | 13 | 2.7 |
| | 490 | 100.0 |

(D-I-W) 3. If Special, indicate kind

| | No. | Pct. |
|---|---|---|
| Literature | 17 | 11.2 |
| Literature-Composition | 20 | 14.0 |
| Linguistics | 16 | 11.1 |
| Composition | 22 | 15.4 |
| Linguistics-Composition | 45 | 31.4 |
| Other | 23 | 16.9 |
| No Response - 347 | 143 | 100.0 |

(D-I-W) 4. Length of Institute

| | No. | Pct. |
|---|---|---|
| 3 weeks | 0 | 0 |
| 4 weeks | 0 | 0 |
| 5 weeks | 5 | 1.0 |
| 6 weeks | 218 | 44.4 |
| 7 weeks | 90 | 18.4 |
| 8 weeks | 162 | 33.1 |
| No Response | 15 | 3.1 |
| | 490 | 100.0 |

(D-I-W) 5. Number of Participants completing Institute

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 25-29 | 33 | 6.7 |
| 30-39 | 128 | 26.2 |
| 40-49 | 241 | 49.2 |
| 50 or more | 84 | 17.1 |
| No Response | 4 | .8 |
| | 490 | 100.0 |

(D-I-W) 6. Chief position in the Institute. Check only one.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Director | 96 | 19.6 |
| Workshop supervisor | 60 | 12.2 |
| Instructor in Literature course | 91 | 18.6 |
| Instructor in Language course | 82 | 16.7 |
| Instructor in Composition course | 86 | 17.6 |
| Other | 46 | 9.4 |
| No Response | 29 | 5.9 |
| | 490 | 100.0 |

(D-I-W) 7. If your institution were to conduct an Institute next year, how do you feel about the length of the Institute?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Same length | 392 | 80.0 |
| Longer | 59 | 12.0 |
| Shorter | 36 | 7.4 |
| No Response | 3 | .6 |
| | 490 | 100.0 |

(D-I-W) 8. If your institution were to conduct an Institute next year, how do you feel about the number of students?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| About the same | 403 | 82.3 |
| Fewer students | 56 | 11.4 |
| More students | 24 | 4.9 |
| No Response | 7 | 1.4 |
| | 490 | 100.0 |

(D) 9. Did your Institute staff (director and instructors) conduct briefing meetings in advance of the Institute?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Yes | 289 | 98.0 |
| No | 6 | 2.0 |
| No Response - 195 | 295 | 100.0 |

(D) 10. Did your Institute staff conduct regular staff discussions as the Institute progressed?

| | No. | Pct. |
|---|---|---|
| Yes | 253 | 91.3 |
| No | 24 | 8.7 |
| No Response - 213 | 277 | 100.0 |

(I) 11. As an instructor of one of the content courses, to what extent were you acquainted with the work of the other content courses?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| To a great extent | 176 | 53.9 |
| Somewhat | 146 | 44.7 |
| Minimal | 5 | 1.4 |
| No Response - 163 | 327 | 100.0 |

(I) 12. As an instructor of one of the content courses, to what extent did you observe classes of other instructors?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| To a great extent | 77 | 23.7 |
| Occasionally | 136 | 41.6 |
| Not at all | 113 | 34.7 |
| No Response - 164 | 326 | 100.0 |

(W) 13. As the workshop supervisor, how well were you acquainted with the course work of the Institute?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| To a great degree | 83 | 76.2 |
| To a moderate degree | 25 | 22.9 |
| Hardly at all | 1 | .9 |
| No Response - 381 | 109 | 100.0 |

(D-I-W) 14. From an overall view how successful do you believe your Institute has been in bringing to the participants new knowledge, new techniques, and new materials in the teaching of English?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Extremely successful | 284 | 58.0 |
| Successful | 180 | 36.7 |
| Moderately successful | 16 | 3.3 |
| Unsuccessful | 1 | .2 |
| No response | 9 | 1.8 |
| | 490 | 100.0 |

(D-I-W) 15. Check the item below which best describes how helpful you feel the Institute has been in showing participants how work in literature, language, and composition (or two of these) can be integrated.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Extremely helpful | 185 | 37.8 |
| Helpful | 240 | 49.0 |
| Some help | 53 | 10.8 |
| No help | 4 | .8 |
| No Response | 8 | 1.6 |
| | 490 | 100.0 |

(D-I-W) 16. In view of the fact that considerable reading is required for the Institute, check one item below which you feel would be valuable for the participants to have prior to the Institute.

| | No. | Pct. |
|---|---|---|
| Reading list for course and workshop | 169 | 34.5 |
| Selected books to be read in preparation for Institute | 268 | 54.7 |
| Duplicated materials used in workshop | 8 | 1.6 |
| None | 38 | 7.8 |
| No Response | 7 | 1.6 |
| | 490 | 100.0 |

(D-I-W) 17. How closely do you feel the participants selected for your institute fit in with the type and the objectives of your Institute?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Very closely | 253 | 51.6 |
| Few exceptions | 214 | 43.7 |
| A number of exceptions | 21 | 4.3 |
| Hardly fit at all | 0 | 0 |
| No Response | 2 | 4 |
| | 490 | 100.0 |

(D-I-W) 18. How well was the Institute -- courses and workshop -- adapted to the needs of English teachers below the college level?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Exceptionally well adapted | 345 | 70.5 |
| Moderately well adapted | 132 | 26.9 |
| Not too well adapted | 1 | .2 |
| No Response | 12 | 2.4 |
| | 490 | 100.0 |

(I) 19. As an instructor in one of the courses, describe your relationship with the Workshop.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Casual observer | 33 | 11.6 |
| Occasional consultant | 99 | 35.1 |
| None | 35 | 12.3 |
| Active and regular participant | 116 | 41.0 |
| No Response - 207 | 283 | 100.0 |

(D-I-W) 20. Do you feel that your Institute was successful in relating content course work to the activities of the Workshop?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Extremely successful | 177 | 36.2 |
| Moderately successful | 206 | 42.1 |
| Did not attempt to relate | 25 | 5.2 |
| No response | 82 | 16.5 |
| | 490 | 100.0 |

(D) 21. What was the attitude of your institution's Department of Education toward the Institute?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Strong interest and support | 85 | 41.7 |
| Cooperative | 82 | 40.4 |
| Tolerated it | 7 | 3.5 |
| No Acquaintance with it | 30 | 14.4 |
| No Response - 286 | 204 | 100.0 |

(D) 22. What was the attitude of your institution's Department of English toward the Institute?

| | No. | Pct. |
|---|---|---|
| Strong interest and support | 147 | 73.5 |
| Cooperative | 34 | 17.0 |
| Tolerated it | 9 | 4.5 |
| No acquaintance with it | 10 | 5.0 |
| No response - 290 | 200 | 100.0 |

(D) 23. What was the attitude of your institution's Administration toward the Institute?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Strong interest and support | 116 | 62.1 |
| Cooperative | 64 | 34.3 |
| Tolerated it | 5 | 2.6 |
| No acquaintance with it | 2 | 1.0 |
| No Response - 303 | 187 | 100.0 |

(D) 24. As a director, did you have freedom in the selection of staff?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Yes | 109 | 95.6 |
| No | 5 | 4.4 |
| No Response - 376 | 114 | 100.0 |

(D) 25. Did the staff include any personnel (other than visiting specialists) from outside your own institution?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Yes | 103 | 72.5 |
| No | 39 | 27.5 |
| No Response - 348 | 142 | 100.0 |

(D) 26. As director, did you devote full time to your duties in the Institute?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Yes | 94 | 87.8 |
| No | 13 | 12.2 |
| No Response - 383 | 107 | 100.0 |

(I-W) 27. As an instructor or a supervisor in the Workshop, did you devote full time to your duties in the Institute?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Yes | 320 | 88.4 |
| No | 42 | 11.6 |
| No Response - 128 | 362 | 100.0 |

(D-I-W) 28. How many years of English teaching experience have you had below the college level?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| None | 199 | 40.6 |
| 1-4 | 105 | 21.4 |
| 5-9 | 83 | 16.9 |
| 10 or more | 98 | 20.1 |
| No Response | 5 | 1.0 |
| | 490 | 100.0 |

(D-I-W) 29. What is your attitude about an Institute staff member's having background in English teaching below the college level in order to direct or teach in the type of Institute in which you were involved?

| | No. | Pct. |
|---|---|---|
| Not necessary | 140 | 28.6 |
| Helpful | 281 | 57.3 |
| Necessary | 60 | 12.2 |
| No Response | 9 | 1.9 |
| | 490 | 100.0 |

(D-I-W) 30. Do you feel the textbooks used in courses and workshop to be on a level with the work carried on in the Institute?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Equal to level | 448 | 91.4 |
| Below the level | 3 | .6 |
| Above the level | 16 | 3.3 |
| No Response | 23 | 4.7 |
| | 490 | 100.0 |

(D-I-W) 31. To what degree did the textbooks used in the courses and workshop present new ideas, new approaches for the participants?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| To a great degree | 413 | 84.3 |
| To a moderate degree | 58 | 11.8 |
| Not at all | 5 | 1.0 |
| No Response | 14 | 2.9 |
| | 490 | 100.0 |

(D-I-W) 32-33. It is possible that most Institutes separated the content of the courses from the workshop activities; that is, applications to the classroom situation were handled solely in the workshop.

32. How was this practice followed in your Institute?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Content and applications strictly separated | 46 | 9.4 |
| Some relevance to classroom applications discernible in content courses | 249 | 50.8 |
| Applications considered freely in both and workshop | 150 | 30.6 |
| No response | 45 | 9.2 |
| | 490 | 100.0 |

33. From your experience do you feel that questions that appy to the participant's classroom should be:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Raised in content course periods | 19 | 3.9 |
| Held off until workshop periods | 91 | 18.6 |
| Considered at any appropriate time | 333 | 68.0 |
| Not brought up at all | 5 | 1.0 |
| No Response | 42 | 8.5 |
| | 490 | 100.0 |

(D-1-W) 34. In relation to participants' own teaching situation, do you feel the activities of the Workshop to be:

| | No. | Pct. |
|---|---|---|
| Introductory to long-range benefits | 38 | 7.8 |
| Of immediate benefit | 33 | 6.7 |
| Combination of the above two | 343 | 70.0 |
| Of benefit vaguely in the future | 14 | 2.9 |
| No Response | 62 | 12.6 |
| | 490 | 100.0 |

(W) 35. Listed below are resource materials of a non-textbook type, some of which were used in the workshop phase of your Institute. Check the one in the group which you feel to have been the most valuable for the participants in developing new and varied approaches to English teaching.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Instructional films | 99 | 44.5 |
| Documentary films | 1 | .5 |
| Tapes | 9 | 4.1 |
| Recordings | 6 | 2.7 |
| Opaque projectors | 9 | 4.1 |
| Overhead projectors and projectors | 38 | 12.6 |
| Filmstrips | 4 | 1.0 |
| Bulletins, monographs | 44 | 20.0 |
| Programmed learning | 1 | .5 |
| No Response - 279 | 221 | 100.0 |

(D-1-W) 36-47. Some Project English experimental curricular materials were made available to your Institute. For each of the materials shown below by project centers, check the appropriate space...as an indication of extent to which the materials were used in your Institute and of the usefulness of the materials to your participants. If materials from some centers were not available in your Institute, check the box under "Materials Not Used."

| | Materials Not Used | | Materials Used But Not Helpful | | Materials Helpful | | No Response | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. |
| 36. Carnegie Tech (social, grammar, success, dictionaries, tragedy, Middle English) | 217 | 44.3 | 14 | 2.8 | 136 | 27.8 | 123 | 25.1 |
| 37. Florida State (myth, modern, nature, adolescents, cognition) | 239 | 48.7 | 13 | 2.7 | 112 | 22.9 | 126 | 25.7 |
| 38. Gallaudet (structure, composition) | 280 | 57.1 | 12 | 2.4 | 65 | 13.3 | 133 | 27.2 |
| 39. Georgia (language, composing) | 233 | 47.6 | 22 | 4.5 | 108 | 22.0 | 127 | 25.9 |
| 40. Hunter (family, verse stories, self-identification, reading book list) | 249 | 50.8 | 9 | 1.8 | 93 | 19.0 | 139 | 28.4 |
| 41. Illinois (qualifications) | 217 | 44.3 | 10 | 2.1 | 132 | 26.9 | 131 | 26.7 |
| 42. Nebraska (fable, satire, words, syntax, rhetoric, elementary) | 132 | 26.9 | 15 | 3.1 | 240 | 49.0 | 103 | 21.0 |
| 43. Northwestern (composition) | 188 | 38.4 | 11 | 2.2 | 175 | 35.7 | 116 | 23.7 |
| 44. Oregon (structure, travel, Steinbeck, London, speech, rhetoric) | 144 | 29.4 | 17 | 3.5 | 232 | 47.3 | 97 | 19.8 |
| 45. Western Reserve (semantics, animal, environment, courage, symbolism power, satire, survival, outcast, culture, protest, hero.) | 214 | 43.7 | 7 | 1.4 | 148 | 30.2 | 121 | 24.7 |
| 46. Wisconsin (teaching literature) | 230 | 46.9 | 13 | 2.7 | 112 | 22.9 | 135 | 27.5 |
| 47. U. S. Office of Education (research projects) | 231 | 47.1 | 16 | 3.3 | 110 | 22.4 | 133 | 28.2 |

TOTALS - 490 100.0

(D-I-W) 48. Check below the one area in which you feel more of such experimental materials are needed.

| | No. | Pct. |
|---|---|---|
| Phonology | 29 | 5.9 |
| Syntax | 54 | 11.0 |
| Usage | 21 | 4.3 |
| Speech | 7 | 1.4 |
| Rhetoric | 79 | 16.1 |
| Style | 49 | 10.0 |
| Creative activities | 26 | 5.3 |
| Analyses of particular genres | 36 | 7.3 |
| Teaching methods | 63 | 12.9 |
| No Response | 126 | 25.8 |
| | 490 | 100.0 |

(D-I-W) 49. Did your Institute have a separate library, one exclusively for use of participants?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Yes | 415 | 84.7 |
| No | 61 | 12.4 |
| No Response | 14 | 2.9 |
| | 490 | 100.0 |

(D-I-W) 50. To what degree were the materials in the library, whether separate or not, useful to participants in their Institute studies?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| To a great degree | 320 | 65.3 |
| To a moderate degree | 140 | 28.6 |
| To a little degree | 11 | 2.2 |
| No Response | 19 | 3.9 |
| | 490 | 100.0 |

(D-I-W) 51. To what degree did the materials of the library give participants an opportunity to examine new materials for their classroom?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| To a great degree | 290 | 59.2 |
| To a moderate degree | 159 | 32.4 |
| To a slight degree | 17 | 3.5 |
| No Response | 24 | 4.9 |
| | 490 | 100.0 |

(D-I-W) 52-54. The use of a variety of films was intended to be a significant phase of the Institute. Please react to the use made of films in your Institute by checking appropriate items in the questions below.

52. How relevant was the content of the films to the work of the Institute?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Relevant | 302 | 61.6 |
| Relevant at times | 112 | 22.9 |
| Not relevant | 9 | 1.8 |
| No Response | 67 | 13.7 |
| | 490 | 100.0 |

53. How extensively were participants prepared by the staff for the showing of the films?

| | No. | Pct. |
|---|---|---|
| Considerable preparation | 125 | 25.5 |
| Limited preparation | 268 | 54.7 |
| None | 18 | 3.7 |
| No Response | 79 | 16.1 |
| | 490 | 100.0 |

54. How adequate was followup discussion of the content of the films?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Adequate | 237 | 48.4 |
| Limited | 150 | 30.6 |
| None | 19 | 3.9 |
| No Response | 84 | 17.1 |
| | 490 | 100.0 |

(D) 55. Check the number of visiting specialists who appeared at your Institute.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| None | 19 | 5.7 |
| 1 or 2 | 40 | 12.2 |
| 3 or more | 268 | 82.1 |
| No Response - 163 | 327 | 100.0 |

(D-I-W) 56. Evaluate the contribution made by the visiting specialist (s)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Clearly relevant to the organized program | 281 | 57.3 |
| Supplementary to the Institute program | 142 | 29.0 |
| Only vaguely relevant to the program | 21 | 4.3 |
| No Response | 46 | 9.4 |
| | 490 | 100.0 |

(D-I-W) 57. Check the one item which describes the most meaningful additional activity of any of the visiting specialists.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Participated in smaller group sessions | 46 | 9.4 |
| Met informally with participants | 114 | 23.3 |
| Conducted question and answer sessions | 260 | 53.0 |
| None | 24 | 4.9 |
| No Response | 46 | 9.4 |
| | 490 | 100.0 |

(D-I-W) 58. During the Institute experience participants have been involved in informal meetings, conversations, and coffee breaks; they have lived, eaten and worked together, sharing ideas and experiences with other English teachers. How useful do you feel this kind of professional association to have been?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Extremely useful | 371 | 75.8 |
| Useful | 100 | 20.4 |
| Moderately useful | 10 | 2.0 |
| Of little use | 2 | .4 |
| No Response | 7 | 1.4 |
| | 490 | 100.0 |

(I) 59. As the instructor of the Literature course, from your observation of the activities and responses of the participants, check below the one characteristic of the course which you believe will be most influential in bringing about changes or innovations in the teaching practices of the participants.

| | No. | Pct. |
|---|---|---|
| More emphasis on close reading of literature | 93 | 75.6 |
| Integration of literature and composition assignments | 15 | 12.2 |
| Additional use of paperbacks | 4 | 3.2 |
| Changes in textbooks | 2 | 1.6 |
| Introduction of literature studied in Institute | 7 | 5.8 |
| None of above | 2 | 1.6 |
| No Response - 367 | 123 | 100.0 |

(I) 60. As the instructor of the Language course, from your observation of the activities and responses of the participants, check below the one characteristic of the course which you believe will be most influential in bringing about changes or innovations in the teaching practices of the participants.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Use of the terminology of structural grammar | 8 | 8.0 |
| Units on the history of thelanguage, levels of usage, dictionary study, local dialects, etc. | 30 | 30.0 |
| Stress on sentence instead of parts of speech | 19 | 19.0 |
| Consideration of other methods of sentence analysis than diagramming | 29 | 29.0 |
| Consideration of language in communication--symbolic, logic, semantics, etc. | 3 | 3.0 |
| None of above | 11 | 11.0 |
| No Response - 390 | 100 | 100.0 |

(I) 61. As the instructor of the Composition course, from your observation of the activities and responses of the participants, check below the one characteristic of the course which you believe will be most influential in bringing about changes or innovations in the teaching practices of the participants.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Generally more emphasis on composition, with shorter and more frequent papers | 48 | 42.6 |
| More class discussion of student's writing, with close analysis | 49 | 43.6 |
| Use of models of composition | 7 | 6.3 |
| More attention to oral composition | 1 | .9 |
| Earlier school writing opportunities | 0 | .0 |
| None of above | 8 | 6.6 |
| No Response - 377 | 113 | 100.0 |

(D) 62-65. From your observation of the course in Literature, evaluate the instructor's effectiveness by ranking the characteristics below in 1, 2, 3, 4 order.

| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | NR |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 62. | Knowledge of his subject | 60 | 33 | 3 | 0 | 394 |
| 63. | Skill on presenting subject | 22 | 32 | 33 | 8 | 395 |
| 64. | Tolerance and helpfulness | 0 | 4 | 13 | 78 | 395 |
| 65. | Interest and enthusiasm in subject | 13 | 27 | 46 | 9 | 395 |

The sum of ranks procedure indicates a preference for 62, followed in order by 63, 65, and 64.

(D) 66-69. From your observation of the course in Language, evaluate the instructor's effectiveness by ranking the characteristics below in 1, 2, 3, 4 order.

| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | NR |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 66. | Knowledge of his subject | 74 | 15 | 10 | 2 | 389 |
| 67. | Skill in presenting subject | 12 | 35 | 36 | 18 | 389 |
| 68. | Tolerance and helpfulness | 6 | 11 | 20 | 64 | 389 |
| 69. | Interest and enthusiasm in subject | 10 | 41 | 34 | 16 | 389 |

The sum of ranks procedure indicates a preference for 66, followed in order by 67, 69, and 68.

(D) 70-73. From your observation of the course in Composition, evaluate the instructor's effectiveness by ranking the characteristics below in 1, 2, 3, 4 order.

| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | NR |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 70. | Knowledge of his subject | 59 | 22 | 14 | 9 | 386 |
| 71. | Skill in presenting subject | 20 | 43 | 30 | 11 | 386 |
| 72. | Tolerance and helpfulness | 7 | 16 | 18 | 63 | 386 |
| 73. | Interest and enthusiasm in subject | 18 | 23 | 42 | 21 | 386 |

The sum of ranks procedure indicates a preference for 70, followed in order by 71, 73, and 72.

(D) 74. In your Institute, will credit -- either graduate or undergraduate -- be granted to participants?

| | No. | Pct. |
|---|---|---|
| Yes | 175 | 96.7 |
| No | 6 | 3.3 |
| No Response - 309 | 181 | 100.0 |

(I-W) 75. If you were to teach the same course again in an Institute, how much work would you plan for the participants?

| | No. | Pct. |
|---|---|---|
| More | 50 | 12.4 |
| The Same | 303 | 75.4 |
| Less | 49 | 12.2 |
| No Response - 88 | 402 | 100.0 |

**FREE RESPONSE**

Please feel free to comment briefly on either or both of the following:

(D-I-W) 1. In the light of your experience as (instructor, director, or workshop supervisor) in this Institute, what specific suggestion would you make to improve the quality and usefulness of such Institute?

(D-I-W) 2. Discuss from your experience what you consider to be the strengths and weaknesses of the Institute in which you were involved. Please be specific.

(SEE APPENDIX C)

# APPENDIX B

## Tables of Relationships

The relationships tabulated below are based on all the responses to the participants' and (in Table II) to the director-staff questionnaires. Percentages were computed only to the first decimal.

### Table 1

Responses of participants to Item 75 (Check the item below which best describes the Institute experience for you).

| Age | Exhilarating experience throughout | Occasionally stimulating | No different from the usual institute study | Generally disappointing | No response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Under 25 | 46.0 | 45.1 | 1.3 | 7.2 | .4 |
| 25-34 | 49.3 | 41.5 | 1.5 | 7.2 | .5 |
| 35-44 | 57.4 | 35.6 | 1.3 | 4.6 | 1.2 |
| 45-54 | 65.0 | 29.1 | 1.2 | 3.2 | 1.5 |
| 55 or more | 74.5 | 22.1 | 2.7 | .7 | 0 |
| **Years of service as English teacher** | | | | | |
| 1.0 - 1.9 | 54.2 | 41.7 | .5 | 3.6 | 0 |
| 2.0 - 2.9 | 52.0 | 37.4 | 1.3 | 8.6 | .7 |
| 3.0 - 4.9 | 51.4 | 39.8 | 1.8 | 6.4 | .6 |
| 5.0 - 9.9 | 55.0 | 37.5 | 1.1 | 5.9 | .6 |
| 10.0 - 14.9 | 57.8 | 34.9 | 1.5 | 4.5 | 1.2 |
| 15.0 - 19.9 | 57.1 | 35.7 | 1.1 | 4.5 | 1.6 |
| 20.0 - 24.9 | 62.4 | 31.2 | 2.4 | 1.8 | 2.4 |
| 25.0 - 29.9 | 74.1 | 19.8 | 2.5 | 1.2 | 2.5 |
| 30 or more | 65.2 | 26.1 | 2.2 | 4.3 | 2.2 |
| **Grades taught** | | | | | |
| Primary | 66.0 | 25.5 | 1.1 | 3.2 | 4.3 |
| Intermediate | 51.0 | 41.0 | 1.5 | 6.0 | .5 |
| Only junior high | 58.0 | 35.7 | 1.3 | 4.5 | .4 |
| Only senior high | 54.2 | 37.7 | 1.5 | 5.6 | .9 |
| Both junior and senior high | 55.5 | 35.6 | 1.1 | 6.8 | .9 |

| Number of undergraduate credits in English | Exhilarating experience throughout | Occasionally stimulating | No different from usual Institute study | Generally disappointing | No response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 17 or fewer | 55.7 | 38.6 | 1.2 | 4.2 | .2 |
| 18-23 | 56.6 | 35.1 | 1.6 | 5.1 | 1.5 |
| 24-35 | 56.0 | 37.0 | 1.6 | 4.5 | .9 |
| 36 or more | 54.2 | 37.3 | 1.2 | 6.5 | .8 |
| **Number of graduate credits in English** | | | | | |
| None | 56.2 | 36.6 | 1.1 | 5.5 | .5 |
| 1-10 | 56.0 | 36.6 | 1.2 | 5.7 | .5 |
| 11-20 | 54.5 | 37.7 | 1.5 | 4.5 | 1.7 |
| 21-30 | 50.7 | 39.4 | 2.4 | 6.6 | 1.0 |
| 31 or more | 55.2 | 36.1 | 2.3 | 3.7 | 2.3 |
| **Number of credits in other related Departments** | | | | | |
| None | 55.0 | 38.5 | 1.6 | 4.7 | .3 |
| 2-12 | 54.4 | 37.4 | 1.4 | 5.9 | .8 |
| 13-20 | 55.5 | 36.2 | 1.6 | 5.6 | 1.1 |
| 21-30 | 55.5 | 36.7 | 1.2 | 4.7 | 1.9 |
| 31 or more | 60.8 | 33.1 | .9 | 4.5 | .6 |
| **Type of Institute** | | | | | |
| General | 54.0 | 37.5 | 1.5 | 6.3 | |
| Special | 58.2 | 35.9 | 1.1 | 3.5 | |
| **Special Institute** | | | | | |
| Literature | 40.9 | 50.4 | .9 | 5.2 | |
| Literature-Composition | 73.5 | 23.5 | | 1.8 | |
| Linguistics | 54,9 | 38.5 | .4 | 5.8 | |
| Composition | 59.8 | 33.8 | 1.7 | 2.1 | |
| Linguistics-Composition | 57.3 | 37.0 | 1.6 | 3.2 | |

## Table 2

Response of participants to Item 14 (How useful has the Institute been in preparing you to handle your own teaching situation, your own students?).

| Age | Extremely useful | Somewhat useful | Not at all useful | No response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Under 25 | 51.5 | 46.0 | 1.3 | 1.3 |
| 25-34 | 53.9 | 42.8 | 1.8 | 1.4 |
| 35-44 | 61.1 | 36.5 | 1.3 | 1.2 |
| 45-54 | 64.1 | 34.4 | .4 | 1.2 |
| 55 or more | 77.9 | 21.5 | 0 | .7 |
| **Years of service as English teacher** | | | | |
| 1.0 - 1.9 | 57.3 | 40.1 | .5 | 2.1 |
| 2.0 - 2.9 | 55.6 | 43.4 | .7 | .3 |
| 3.0 - 4.9 | 54.1 | 42.2 | 2.2 | 1.5 |
| 5.0 - 9.9 | 58.2 | 39.2 | 1.2 | 1.4 |
| 10.0 - 14.9 | 60.4 | 37.0 | 1.4 | 1.2 |
| 15.0 - 19.9 | 63.7 | 34.1 | 1.1 | 1.1 |
| 20.0 - 24.9 | 68.8 | 30.6 | 0 | .6 |
| 25.0 - 29.9 | 70.4 | 28.4 | 0 | 1.2 |
| 30 or more | 63.0 | 37.0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Grades taught** | | | | |
| Primary | 57.4 | 37.2 | 1.1 | 4.3 |
| Intermediate | 54.5 | 41.5 | 0 | 4.0 |
| Only junior high | 58.2 | 39.7 | 1.2 | .8 |
| Only senior high | 58.9 | 38.6 | 1.4 | 1.1 |
| Both junior high and senior high | 60.2 | 37.3 | 1.5 | .9 |

| Number of undergraduate credits in English | Extremely useful | Somewhat useful | Not at all useful | No response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 17 or fewer | 61.4 | 37.0 | .2 | 1.4 |
| 18-23 | 57.2 | 39.7 | .8 | 2.3 |
| 24-35 | 59.3 | 38.1 | 1.6 | 1.0 |
| 36 or more | 58.3 | 39.1 | 1.5 | 1.0 |
| **Number of graduate credits in English** | | | | |
| None | 58.5 | 39.2 | 1.2 | 1.1 |
| 1-10 | 61.1 | 36.2 | 1.4 | 1.3 |
| 11-20 | 57.7 | 39.9 | .8 | 1.5 |
| 21-30 | 54.6 | 42.5 | 1.6 | 1.3 |
| 31 or more | 57.5 | 39.5 | 1.3 | 1.7 |
| **Number of credits in other related departments** | | | | |
| None | 55.4 | 42.4 | 1.1 | 1.1 |
| 2-12 | 58.9 | 38.8 | 1.1 | 1.2 |
| 13-20 | 58.9 | 37.7 | 1.8 | 1.6 |
| 21-30 | 59.5 | 38.6 | 1.2 | .7 |
| 31 or more | 63.0 | 33.4 | 1.8 | 1.8 |
| **Type of Institute** | | | | |
| General | 56.4 | 41.2 | 1.5 | .9 |
| Special | 63.7 | 33.5 | .9 | 1.9 |
| **Special Institute** | | | | |
| Literature | 49.6 | 45.2 | 1.7 | 3.5 |
| Literature-Composition | 77.1 | 21.7 | 1.2 | 0 |
| Linguistics | 42.0 | 52.7 | 1.3 | 4.0 |
| Composition | 76.1 | 20.5 | .4 | 3.0 |
| Linguistics-Composition | 68.9 | 29.3 | .5 | 1.4 |

Table 3

Relationship between participants' responses to Item 73 (Check the one teaching problem that most vexed you as a teacher before enrolling in the Institute) and to Item 14 (How useful has the Institute been in preparing you to handle your own teaching situations, your own students?).

| One teaching problem | Extremely useful | Somewhat useful | Not at all useful | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Motivating students | 54.0 | 44.8 | .3 | .9 |
| Handling low reading ability of students | 49.2 | 48.4 | 1.8 | .5 |
| Coping with your own lack of background in literature, language, and composition | 65.5 | 32.8 | .7 | 1.0 |
| Meeting individual differences | 53.7 | 43.8 | 1.5 | 1.0 |
| Determining what is significant to teach | 58.6 | 38.2 | 1.6 | 1.7 |
| Using effective teaching methods | 59.1 | 38.1 | 1.6 | 1.3 |
| Finding and using appropriate materials | 58.4 | 36.7 | 1.8 | 3.1 |
| Evaluating student achievement | 57.5 | 40.6 | 1.5 | .4 |
| No response | 71.1 | 26.3 | 0 | 2.6 |

## Table 4

Relationship between participants' responses to Item 14 (How useful has the Institute been in preparing you to handle your own teaching situation, your own students?) and to Item 73 (Check the one teaching problem that most vexed you as a teacher before enrolling in the Institute).

| Usefulness of Institute | Motivating students | Handling low reading ability of students | Coping with own lack of background | Meeting individual differences | Determining what is significant to teach | Using effective teaching methods | Finding-using appropriate materials | Evaluating student achievement | NR |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Extremely useful | 7.4 | 7.7 | 29.4 | 8.6 | 22.7 | 9.3 | 7.8 | 6.1 | 1.1 |
| Somewhat useful | 9.4 | 11.5 | 22.4 | 10.6 | 22.5 | 9.1 | 7.4 | 6.5 | .6 |
| Not at all useful | 1.9 | 13.2 | 15.1 | 11.3 | 28.3 | 11.3 | 11.3 | 7.5 | 0 |
| No response | 5.7 | 3.8 | 20.8 | 7.5 | 30.2 | 9.4 | 18.9 | 1.9 | 1.9 |

Table 5

Relationship between participants' responses to Item 12 (Indicate in what grades you teach English) and to Item 73 (Check the one teaching problem that most vexed you as a teacher before enrolling in the Institute).

| Grades taught | Motivating students | Handling low reading ability of students | Coping with own lack of background | Meeting individual differences | Determining what is significant to teach | Using effective teaching methods | Finding-using appropriate materials | Evaluating student achievement | NR |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Primary (1-3) | 5.3 | 20.2 | 24.5 | 10.6 | 12.8 | 12.8 | 5.3 | 5.3 | 3.2 |
| Intermediate (4-6) | 5.5 | 12.5 | 26.5 | 14.5 | 20.5 | 7.0 | 6.5 | 5.5 | 1.5 |
| Only junior high (7-9) | 6.3 | 9.6 | 31.5 | 7.7 | 24.5 | 6.9 | 8.2 | 4.7 | .6 |
| Only senior high (10-12) | 8.8 | 8.1 | 24.0 | 9.6 | 23.0 | 10.1 | 8.1 | 7.4 | .9 |
| Both junior and senior high | 9.8 | 10.0 | 27.3 | 8.9 | 22.0 | 10.4 | 6.3 | 4.5 | .8 |
| No response | 2.6 | 7.9 | 34.2 | 18.4 | 13.2 | 5.3 | 13.2 | 5.3 | 0 |

## Table 6

Responses of participants to Item 74 (To what degree has the Institute met the problem you checked above?)

| Age | To a great degree | To a moderate degree | Not at all | No response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Under 25 | 35.9 | 51.5 | 11.4 | 1.3 |
| 25-34 | 41.9 | 45.3 | 11.9 | .9 |
| 35-44 | 46.7 | 42.3 | 10.4 | .6 |
| 45-54 | 48.0 | 40.9 | 9.8 | 1.3 |
| 55 or more | 53.7 | 40.3 | 6.0 | 0 |
| Number of years of service as an English teacher | | | | |
| 1.0 - 1.9 | 42.2 | 50.0 | 7.8 | 0 |
| 2.0 - 2.9 | 42.4 | 46.7 | 10.3 | .7 |
| 3.0 - 4.9 | 43.5 | 44.2 | 11.7 | .7 |
| 5.0 - 9.9 | 43.7 | 45.2 | 10.6 | .6 |
| 10.0 - 14.9 | 46.6 | 41.3 | 11.1 | 1.0 |
| 15.0 - 19.9 | 45.1 | 42.4 | 10.4 | 2.1 |
| 20.0 - 24.9 | 57.1 | 34.1 | 7.1 | 1.8 |
| 25.0 - 29.9 | 42.0 | 45.7 | 12.3 | 0 |
| 30 or more | 37.0 | 41.3 | 19.6 | 2.2 |
| Grades taught | | | | |
| Primary | 53.2 | 37.2 | 6.4 | 3.2 |
| Intermediate | 47.0 | 45.5 | 7.0 | .5 |
| Only junior high | 47.4 | 43.9 | 8.3 | .4 |
| Only senior high | 42.7 | 44.1 | 12.2 | 1.1 |
| Both junior and senior high | 45.3 | 43.2 | 11.2 | .4 |

| Number of undergraduate credits in English | To a great degree | To a moderate degree | Not at all | No response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 17 or fewer | 55.3 | 38.9 | 5.6 | .2 |
| 18-23 | 46.6 | 44.1 | 8.8 | .5 |
| 24-35 | 45.8 | 43.4 | 10.1 | .6 |
| 36 or more | 39.8 | 45.4 | 13.4 | 1.4 |
| **Number of graduate credits in English** | | | | |
| None | 49.1 | 41.8 | 8.6 | .4 |
| 1-10 | 45.5 | 44.2 | 9.3 | 1.0 |
| 11-20 | 41.1 | 44.6 | 13.3 | 1.0 |
| 21-30 | 33.6 | 50.1 | 14.4 | 1.8 |
| 31 or more | 36.5 | 45.5 | 17.1 | 1.0 |
| **Number of credits in other related departments** | | | | |
| None | 43.8 | 46.4 | 9.0 | .8 |
| 2-12 | 45.1 | 44.6 | 9.8 | .5 |
| 13-20 | 43.6 | 41.5 | 13.1 | 1.8 |
| 21-30 | 43.6 | 44.1 | 11.6 | .7 |
| 31 or more | 46.4 | 38.6 | 13.6 | 1.5 |
| **Type of Institute** | | | | |
| General | 43.6 | 45.0 | 10.9 | .6 |
| Special | 46.9 | 41.4 | 10.4 | 1.3 |
| **Special Institute** | | | | |
| Literature | 27.0 | 48.7 | 23.5 | .9 |
| Literature-Composition | 57.8 | 38.0 | 4.2 | 0 |
| Linguistics | 34.5 | 48.7 | 16.4 | .4 |
| Composition | 58.5 | 35.9 | 3.4 | 2.1 |
| Linguistics-Composition | 52.0 | 40.2 | 6.6 | 1.1 |

Table 7

Relationship between participants' response to Item 73 (Check the one teaching problem that most vexed you as a teacher before enrolling in the Institute) and to Item 74 (To what degree has the Institute met the problem you checked above?)

| Problem that most vexed participant before enrolling in Institute | To a great degree | To a moderate degree | Not at all | No response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Motivating students | 26.8 | 55.5 | 16.8 | .9 |
| Handling low reading ability | 15.1 | 44.0 | 40.4 | .5 |
| Coping with own lack of background in literature, language and composition | 65.3 | 33.1 | 1.6 | 0 |
| Meeting individual differences | 13.7 | 61.8 | 23.9 | .5 |
| Determining what is significant to teach | 53.4 | 42.4 | 4.0 | .2 |
| Using effective teaching methods | 47.4 | 43.8 | 8.5 | .3 |
| Finding and using appropriate materials | 48.3 | 48.0 | 3.7 | 0 |
| Evaluating student achievement | 33.3 | 51.0 | 14.9 | .8 |

Table 8

Item chosen by participants as primary value in literature course.

| | Years of service | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Item | 1.0-1.9 | 2.0-2.9 | 3.0-4.9 | 5.0-9.9 | 10.0-14.9 | 15.0-19.9 | 20.0-24.9 | 25.0-29.9 | 30 or more |
| Knowledge and techniques of close reading of a literary work | 33.9 | 32.5 | 34.2 | 33.8 | 36.0 | 34.1 | 32.9 | 23.5 | 39.1 |
| Varied approaches to the study of a literary work | 20.3 | 17.9 | 20.2 | 19.8 | 19.4 | 20.0 | 14.7 | 21.0 | 8.7 |
| Acquaintance with literature and writers new to participants | 14.1 | 13.9 | 14.6 | 13.9 | 12.9 | 10.7 | 11.8 | 9.9 | 13.0 |
| New techniques in reading and presenting specific genres | 5.7 | 6.6 | 8.3 | 9.9 | 6.2 | 9.1 | 5.9 | 14.8 | 6.5 |
| No response | 26.0 | 29.1 | 22.7 | 22.7 | 25.5 | 26.1 | 34.7 | 30.9 | 34.8 |

| | Grades taught | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Item | Primary | Intermediate | Only junior high | Only senior high | Both junior and senior high |
| Knowledge and techniques of close reading of a literary work | 21.3 | 27.0 | 29.6 | 36.9 | 34.1 |
| Varied approaches to the study of a literary work | 8.5 | 11.0 | 17.9 | 20.6 | 22.2 |
| Acquaintance with literature and writers new to participants | 24.5 | 21.5 | 15.3 | 11.8 | 12.3 |
| New techniques in reading and presenting specific genres | 13.8 | 10.5 | 7.5 | 8.3 | 8.5 |
| No response | 31.9 | 30.0 | 29.8 | 22.5 | 22.9 |

Table 9

Item chosen by participants as primary value in language course.

| Item | Years of service<br>1.0-1.9 | 2.0-2.9 | 3.0-4.9 | 5.0-9.9 | 10.0-14.9 | 15.0-19.9 | 20.0-24.9 | 25.0-29.9 | 30 or more |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Awareness of language as a field of study | 41.1 | 34.4 | 37.6 | 34.8 | 37.4 | 35.5 | 39.4 | 32.1 | 45.7 |
| Knowledge and appreciation of the current grammars | 29.7 | 31.1 | 35.5 | 33.9 | 30.1 | 34.9 | 31.2 | 27.2 | 26.1 |
| Practical applications to the classroom | 5.2 | 6.6 | 4.8 | 5.6 | 5.6 | 6.4 | 10.0 | 11.1 | 4.3 |
| Better understanding of usage problems | 8.9 | 10.6 | 9.0 | 10.4 | 12.2 | 8.0 | 4.7 | 4.9 | 13.0 |
| No response | 15.1 | 17.2 | 13.1 | 15.3 | 15.1 | 15.2 | 14.7 | 24.7 | 10.9 |

| Item | Grades taught<br>Primary | Intermediate | Only junior high | Only senior high | Both junior and senior high |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Awareness of language as a field of study | 36.2 | 33.5 | 33.7 | 38.1 | 34.8 |
| Knowledge and appreciation of the current grammars | 27.7 | 29.5 | 35.5 | 32.6 | 32.6 |
| Practical applications to the classroom | 11.7 | 12.0 | 6.8 | 4.4 | 7.4 |
| Better understanding of usage problems | 10.6 | 13.5 | 9.1 | 9.5 | 11.6 |
| No response | 13.8 | 11.5 | 14.9 | 15.6 | 13.6 |

| Item | Age | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Under 25 | 25-34 | 35-44 | 45-54 | 55 or more |
| Your own improved writing skills | 28.7 | 26.9 | 25.0 | 23.9 | 26.8 |
| Better evaluation of student writing | 12.7 | 13.5 | 13.6 | 15.1 | 13.4 |
| Ways to evoke good writing from students | 15.2 | 19.4 | 22.7 | 25.6 | 28.2 |
| Knowledge of rhetorical principles | 24.9 | 26.4 | 24.8 | 22.5 | 15.4 |
| No response | 18.1 | 13.8 | 13.8 | 13.0 | 16.1 |

| Item | Undergraduate credits in English | | | | Number of graduate credits | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 17 or fewer | 18-23 | 24-35 | 36 or more | None | 1-10 | 11-20 | 21-30 | 31 or more |
| Your own improved writing skills | 36.1 | 28.0 | 25.2 | 22.7 | 28.7 | 25.8 | 24.6 | 20.7 | 18.7 |
| Better evaluation of student writing | 15.0 | 11.9 | 13.8 | 14.5 | 14.2 | 15.1 | 11.4 | 10.5 | 14.4 |
| Ways to evoke good writing from students | 20.4 | 23.2 | 21.6 | 21.6 | 20.8 | 20.9 | 22.2 | 25.7 | 25.4 |
| Knowledge of rhetorical principles | 15.0 | 22.7 | 27.8 | 25.3 | 24.2 | 26.2 | 27.8 | 21.8 | 19.1 |
| No response | 13.6 | 14.2 | 11.7 | 15.9 | 12.1 | 12.0 | 14.0 | 21.3 | 22.4 |

## Table 10

Item chosen by participants as primary value in composition course.

| | Years of service | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Item | 1.0-1.9 | 2.0-2.9 | 3.0-4.9 | 5.0-9.9 | 10.0-14.9 | 15.0-19.9 | 20.0-24.9 | 25.0-29.9 | 30 or more |
| Your own improved writing skills | 28.6 | 28.5 | 25.8 | 25.6 | 27.5 | 22.7 | 22.4 | 21.0 | 19.6 |
| Better evaluation of student writing | 17.7 | 13.2 | 13.7 | 13.6 | 14.3 | 12.8 | 12.4 | 12.3 | 19.6 |
| Ways to evoke good writing from students | 19.3 | 15.2 | 22.5 | 20.3 | 21.6 | 27.5 | 30.0 | 24.7 | 26.1 |
| Knowledge of rhetorical principles | 17.7 | 23.8 | 26.3 | 26.7 | 24.3 | 23.7 | 18.8 | 18.5 | 10.9 |
| No response | 16.7 | 18.9 | 11.7 | 13.8 | 12.5 | 13.3 | 16.5 | 23.5 | 21.7 |

| | Grades taught | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Item | Primary | Intermediate | Only junior high | Only senior high | Only junior and senior high |
| Your own improved writing skills | 24.5 | 30.0 | 27.5 | 23.7 | 30.5 |
| Better evaluation of student writing | 6.4 | 7.5 | 14.1 | 14.7 | 13.3 |
| Ways to evoke good writing from students | 24.5 | 24.0 | 19.9 | 22.3 | 21.0 |
| Knowledge of rhetorical principles | 11.7 | 8.0 | 26.2 | 26.3 | 23.3 |
| No response | 33.0 | 30.5 | 12.3 | 13.0 | 11.9 |

## Table 11

Opinion of directors and staff about usefulness of teaching experience below college level to the faculty of the Institute.

| Number of years respondent had taught below college level | Not Necessary | Helpful | Necessary | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| None | 52.5 | 44.9 | .5 | 2.1 |
| 1 - 4 | 22.9 | 69.5 | 4.8 | 2.8 |
| 5 - 9 | 6.0 | 66.3 | 27.7 | 0 |
| 10 or more | 7.1 | 64.2 | 27.6 | 1.1 |
| No response | 0 | 16.7 | 66.6 | 16.7 |

Table 12

Relationship between participants' combined undergraduate and graduate English credits and their opinion of practical utility and work load of institute

| Institute Usefulness in Own Teaching Situation | 17 or Fewer Undergraduate And No Graduate | 36 or More Undergraduate And 31 or More Graduate |
|---|---|---|
| Extremely | 58.1 | 57.5 |
| Somewhat | 40.4 | 39.5 |
| Not at all | 0 | 1.5 |
| No Response | 1.5 | 1.5 |
| **Work Load** | | |
| Much too heavy | 17.3 | 12.5 |
| Too heavy | 46.6 | 25.0 |
| About right | 34.7 | 57.5 |
| Too light | 1.1 | 3.5 |
| No response | .3 | 1.5 |

# APPENDIX C

## Selected remarks from comments written in "Free Response" section of participants' questionnaire and director-staff questionnaire

## NDEA ENGLISH INSTITUTES -- PARTICIPANT QUESTIONNAIRE

The following are excerpts from the free response section of the 1965 Participant Questionnaire of the NDEA English Institutes. The participants were asked to comment briefly on either or both of the following:

1. To what extent has your work in the Institute prepared you to take an an active part in the revitalizing and upgrading of English teaching? Comment on how you believe the members of this Institute can best make use of their training in their own classrooms and their own school programs.

2. Comment on how you think future Institutes can best serve the English teacher.

Most of the comments were positive, many of them highly laudatory. They suggest that a heavy majority of the participants found the experience valuable. The comments on No. 2 clearly favored the retention of the Institute program, with many perceptive suggestions offered about the future role of such Institutes.

The free response also gave participants an opportunity to react to their experience, an opportunity denied them by the 75-item questionnaire. Therefore, praise, blame, complaints, suggestions, recommendations, and personal gripes appeared throughout the free responses.

The comments below represent simply a sampling at random of the free responses -- about half selected from the positive responses and about half from the negative. However, it must be emphasized that a clear majority of the comments in the 4,185 questionnaires were favorable.

Please get instructors who (a) have as much practical experience as we do (b) were once English majors themselves (c) can take divergent viewpoints gracefully and tactfully.

Divide composition classes into smaller divisions at least occasionally.

The Institute has caught us up with current trends.

I feel I have a definite contribution to make to the meetings of my department next year.

I hope to visit schools of other participants at this Institute.

This has been my most useful summer.

I have been asked by my chairman to give an in-service course in linguistics.

The purpose of the workshop should be clearly defined in advance so that no time is lost getting started.

The most important thing about the Institute is that we were exposed to material and reading which we couldn't possibly get any other place while teaching.

This Institute gave me the first real personal attention I have ever received in a college course.

I will not be afraid to try out new materials, new programs.

This is an experience that every English teacher should have.

I can honestly say that the Institute has been the best thing that I have ever experienced in any phase of education -- high school, college, or in teaching.

The Institute was a humbling but exciting and challenging experience.

Far too often we were looked down upon as being rather ignorant. We were made to feel rather inferior.

Too much pressure on grades.

The director should not subject his students to the stinking smell of stale pipe smoke.

More opportunities to discuss problems with other teachers.

Some people received so much more money than others. I believe that equal pay should be given for equal work.

The informal "relaxed attention" approach was a nice change from past college experiences.

The Institute provided a necessary shock treatment, forcing me to reconsider some rather dogmatic approaches I have used in the past.

The keystone of this Institute -- and I suspect this is unique in these institutes -- was creativity. Assignments were open-ended, evaluations were incisive, complete, and provocative.

Stress discussion workshops in practical areas of teaching.

I feel that the workshop was unrelated and unnecessary. It was tacked on to the end, using time that could have been better spent with literature and writing.

Composition assignments will probably be more practical and realistic as a result of the summer writing assignments.

Vigorous, competent teachers....

Supreme professionalism and sheer brilliance of two of my professors....

I am going to return to my home and revise the course of study that I shall be offering the students in my senior English classes this fall.

Teaching English has become real.

The experience of actually writing has been a grueling but vitally necessary experience to help me to understand the demands placed on my students.

I feel more "up-to-date" in the field of English.

I plan to make a radical change in my own English program -- shifting to a writing centered program with emphasis upon development of thinking skills by the students.

I suggest that a crash program, by its very nature, asks for failure to some degree. Perhaps a smaller amount of subject matter, with opportunity to digest and examine it, might be very profitable.

These questions can best be answered a year from now.

I was depressed by the dissembling and cheating.

I would suggest that future institutes greatly limit history of the language, phonology, and morphology.

The workshop was too much like an education class.

More free reading time was needed.

As the Institute progressed, confidence and faith participants had in themselves was slowly and surely undermined.

I shall spend less time teaching traditional grammar and more letting students learn syntax through writing and rearranging sentences in all possible ways.

Without a doubt the composition program in my school will improve as a result of studying the writing steps from the Northwestern curriculum and the rewriting material from Nebraska.

The workshop should have been more "practical."

Have a followup for present Institute class.

Having a block of free time available for quiet study and work on individual problems would prove beneficial.

I think the best part of the institute is that 30 sincere English teachers could meet, learn together, and really discuss the problems of teaching.

It has given me an opportunity to look at the newest materials available for teaching English.

For the first time, I have been given a clear and usable notion of the basis of literary criticism, how to be meaningfully critical in a variety of ways, and how to stimulate a similar response in my students.

Program in linguistics has left me confused and without a firm foundation to support any ideas or matters of correctness.

I think that my most valuable contribution will be as a source of information to other members of my school's staff. I will be the only one of a department of 15 who has had any experience with linguistics.

I have become more aware of the need for becoming a member of the professional organizations which are available for English teachers.

This Institute was not conducted as an institute but as three separate college classes. I believe individual stipends should be substituted for the Institute Program approach.

Most of the work was completely irrelevant to high school teaching.

The idea of bringing writers in to talk to us was excellent.

Too much emphasis on study of rhetoric.

Take several teachers from same school in future institutes.

I think General Institutes are heavily overloaded. The courses, plus a variety of extra-curricular activities, plus the severe inconvenience of shuffling over an immense campus. I suggest a four-week course in one subject -- followed by two-week workshop.

No ready-made answers, but I have been compelled to think.

Language was a hodge-podge. We tried to cover too much and the result was chaos.

More respectful attitude toward the students on the part of some instructors.

Linguistics is such a new field it should be done separately.

Lectures by literature scholars not educationists.

Less emphasis on "togetherness" among participants.

More blending of the practical with the academic.

A glance at a recent English Journal showed me how much more meaningful the articles on linguistics and composition now are.

Grateful for the contact with the New Criticism approach to literature.

I feel better qualified to select books and other material.

I learned little about linguistics that I did not know. No attempt was made to show the usefulness of this material in the classroom.

I leave the institute as a rather puzzled linguistics student, hoping that this material will come into focus.

Surely there is a Golden Mean somewhere between the abstract considerations of literature and language and the morass of specific teacher-classroom problems.

I never dreamed that I wrote so poorly until I wrote my first essay.

I feel as though I had never really taught English before, and I will never be satisfied to use my old methods again.

The composition and literature teachers moved me to take my "spare" minutes and begin writing a novelette or long short story -- about twelve pages are finished.

I find that judging the extent to which the institute has affected me is difficult now because I have not had time to feel the impact -- I am still staggering under the load.

Structural and transformational grammar were both discussed. Prior to coming to the Institute, I had not heard of either approach.

One helpful feature of the Institute is the interchange of ideas among the members.

I am eager to go home and read, read, read.

The overall atmosphere of this institute has been one of destruction rather than construction, discouragement rather than encouragement. I have been fairly well demoralized and shattered.

I am so tired that my main concern is to get some rest before school starts.

I have acquired enough knowledge and instructional materials to conduct two one-hour in-service classes a month for our English Department for at least 7 or 8 months.

...establish an atmosphere in which the institute member feels as a co-professional with the institute faculty.

I shall return to the high school classroom prepared to teach composition. I now know what to emphasize, what approach to take, and how to evaluate objectively.

I would like to have been personally counseled at the beginning of the Institute and helped to work out my problem.

We found the demonstration classes with the teenagers most helpful and well-conducted.

I feel more seminars in literature, language, and composition would have been preferable to some of the movies we saw.

As a result of this I can now be confident n the role of chairman of the English Department.

I have kept an idea book in which I have collected materials from other members of the Institute.

Less emphasis on cramming courses. Far too much was attempted and thus far too little achieved.

The Institute has made me decide to set aside a part of everyday for reading for my own purpose and not to give all my free time to lesson planning and correcting papers.

The "new" grammars have thrown a new light on my lesson plans for sentence work.

The work of the structural linguists has opened up a whole new field of knowledge and exploration for me and has made me more aware of the intricacies and complexities of language.

Get professors who know the difference between talking and teaching, lecturing and teaching. In colleges there is too much talking and lecturing and not enough teaching.

I could not find time to use the Institute library.

I have been in the midst of conscientious colleagues and under scholarly leadership -- a wonderful experience which more teachers should have.

I was disappointed not to have any work in speech or oral English.

I have never been offered a greater life-line.

We must work to get better composition books published.

The Institute has made me aware of the work begun by the Project English groups and these units have given me vital ideas of improving my teaching.

...this is the first real challenge that has come into some of the participants' little ordered lives.

More practical and less theoretical.

I believe that my Language course has given me the courage to go back and fight the traditionalists.

Employ instructors who have an interest in and knowledge of high school teaching.

Include more work which can actually be used when the teacher returns to the classroom.

More time for personal conferences.

It was most helpful to have my personal writing criticized.

I have gained immeasurably from this Institute! Hurrah for the U. S. Government!

Bring secondary and elementary teachers together to exchange ideas, learn about each other and to help formulate or contribute ideas for unification of the whole language arts program K-12.

Making me aware of how little I know -- particularly in the grammar area.

Project English is vital; please continue it.

More socializing earlier.

What a tremendous boon to the teaching profession in general and to English teachers specifically.

Language part should be revamped completely -- omit technical detail, provide general overview, assume people know nothing about linguistics.

Instructors often failed to make assignments clear.

The workshop was of no value.

Instructors have been helpful, kind, interesting, and available.

## NDEA ENGLISH INSTITUTES -- DIRECTOR-STAFF QUESTIONNAIRE

The directors and staff of the NDEA English Institutes were given an opportunity to comment on the following in the free response section of the questionnaire:

1. In the light of your experience as (instructor, director, or workshop supervisor) in this Institute, what specific suggestion would you make to improve the quality and usefulness of such Institute?

2. Discuss from your experience what you consider to be the strengths and weaknesses of the Institute in which you were involved. Please be specific.

The statements below are simply gleanings selected without any pattern from the free responses. They represent a sampling of some of the suggestions of the staff as well as some of the strengths and weaknesses noted in particular institutes.

Greatest strength was participation of each faculty and staff member at every activitiy, including classes.

Classroom was air-conditioned.

My major wish would be to find a better workshop procedure.

Our greatest strength resulted from our decision to limit the Institute to Language and Composition. We were able to integrate the material of the courses quite closely.

A followup program, supported by NDEA funds and allowing a member of the Institute staff to spend a good fraction of his time during at least the next few months visiting schools and holding conferences with the participants.

Longer time and greater support needed for advance planning, evaluation of Project English material, integration of the various areas.

More institutes in English for the Elementary School.

Smaller classes in composition.

A more realistic definition of the term "advanced study" .

Less concern for practical applications, methods, and materials.

In the workshop less emphasis should be given to projects.

_If_ a workshop, what should it try to do?

Particpants expected the Institute would provide solutions for each of their special local problems -- football coaches as principals, a large number of culturally deprived students, non-English speaking students, etc.

Teach a background of classical rhetoric in the Composition course.

Perhaps too little attention to new experimental methods and materials.

The most valuable feature of the whole NDEA Institute program is that it puts English on the agenda for continuing nation-wide concern.

An understanding on the part of all the participants as to the place methods was to have in the offerings.

Perhaps we should set aside an hour each day for personal conferences.

Introduction of a faculty member whose primary function would be tutorial with regard to Composition.

Too much writing for one composition teacher to read.

More time for independent study.

Coordinate major assignments among instructors.

More homogeneous grouping.

Project English materials mailed to staff earlier.

Staff members should devote full time to Institute.

More conference rooms for small workshop groups.

De-emphasize the workshop activities.

Elimination of graduate credits -- self-improvement real incentive.

Demonstration of applications of various techniques directly in a secondary classroom.

Bring in administration at times for mutual discussions.

Bring in speakers who are both writers and teachers.

Participants should live in one dormitory.

Separate library.

Lack of time for free exchange between participants and staff.

More extensive pre-planning.

Lack-luster performances by several visiting specialists.

Too comprehensive.

Fewer films more carefully screened.

Easier availability of books and other source materials.

Grades???

More study time -- more free reading.

Colleague-to-colleague stance, not student-to-teacher.

Too many activities incidental to the central activity.

Institute staff closer together in planning and execution.

Complete absence of condescending attitude.

Excessive written work required.

Quality of instruction main strength.

General planning of workshop.

More careful screening of applicants.

Presence of a high school teacher as a workshop adviser.

Daily staff meetings for planning.

Younger participants and more men.

Failure to recognize new developments in professional education.

In the future Director should be forbidden to double as an instructor.

I was not prepared to handle all the human problems that arise: housing to be found, babysitters hired, marital fights refereed (from a director who taught a course).

Not too much acquaintance with what is taking place in high school English classes.

Too much tension and negative reaction on being tested in detail on unfamiliar material which could not be absorbed in the short time allowed.

"Master" high school teachers on hand for the workshops.

Require all participants to live on campus.

Language course should be built around a single text -- Gleason's Linguistics and English Grammar for example.

Greatest strength: high morale and espirit de corps.

Too much attempted in too little time.

Break up literature group into two smaller sections for discussion.

Staff should have role in "workshop" sessions.

Inform candidates completely about the intensive work program involved.

Scheduling should allow more time for participants to read, think, use the library, attend individual conferences.

Fewer students per instructor.

Our informality and free exchange of ideas are very helpful. We have golfed, bowled, picnicked and dined together.

Eliminate anyone who continually gripes about the amount of work required.

Planning was thorough.

Our great strength was that we did not have a conventional workshop. Instead we had regular afternoon sessions: At some we had distinguished speakers; at some, carefully chosen films or records; at others, discussions which ranged from the value of research papers to an analysis of a Shakespearean sonnet.

A strength: a flexible schedule that allowed us to meet the needs of our participants.

I have never taught in a more satisfying situation.

We were too much inclined to overstructure everything.

Greatest strength: the professional respect (thus high morale) of staff for students and vice versa.

# APPENDIX D

## Checklist for Evaluators in Pilot Study to Develop Criteria for Evaluating NDEA Institutes in English

## Summer, 1965

Institution and place at which institute is conducted:

Classification of institute: General/Special

Title of institute:

Dates institute is in session:

Number and classification of participants:

Titles or brief descriptions of components in the program:

Name of director:

Name or names of associate director and other administrative staff:

Names of teachers or supervisors of components in the program:

Names of special lecturers, consultants, others who participate in teaching or directing the institute but who do not participate in the institute for its full term:

Is graduate credit offered for any of the components of the program?

## I Purposes and Plan

1. How do the director and members of the staff describe the purposes of the institute?

2. How, according to the director and members of the staff, is the plan of the institute -- the components in the program and the relationships between them -- designed to fulfill these purposes?

3. Who decided on the classification of the participants to be enrolled in the institute? Why was it decided to enroll participants of this kind?

4. What reasons do the director and members of the staff give for deciding on the purposes they have chosen, and for choosing to try to accomplish these purposes in the ways they have planned?

5. Have the purposes and plan of the institute, and the reasons it is designed as it is, ever been explained to the participants? Do the participants seem to know the purposes the institute is intended to accomplish, and why it is planned as it is? Do they seem to accept these purposes and this plan as useful? Do the participants see purposes and uses in the institute different from those conceived by the people who planned it?

6. Have the purposes or plan of the institute changed since the proposal for an institute was submitted? If so, how have they changed, and who changed them?

7. What other questions ought to be asked of the purposes and plan of an NDEA institute in English?

## II Relationships with teachers and administrators outside the institute

8. When was the topic of the institute, or the kind of institute it was to be, decided? Who decided its topic, kind, purposes, and plan, and the classification of participants it would seek to enroll? Who was primarily responsible for writing the proposal?

9. How many faculty members in the department of English at the host institution were consulted when the institute was planned? How many of these faculty members took a significant part in planning the institute or preparing the proposal?

10. Are any members of the department of English at the host institution who are not teaching in the institute participating in it in any formal way, such as delivering lectures, joining in workshops, etc.?

11. How closely aware of what is happening in the institute are the chairman and other administrators in the department of English at the host institution? How fully do they endorse the purposes of the institute? In what ways is this endorsement manifested?

12. Do the chairman and other members of the department of English think the institute is effective? Do they agree that the purposes attempted by the institute should be accepted as part of the central responsibility of a college or university department of English? Do they think another such institute should be conducted by the department of English?

13. Are there any plans to incorporate some of the components of the program of the institute into the regular graduate (or undergraduate) offerings of the department of English? Are there any plans or suggestions to fulfill the purposes of the institute in some other ways -- year-long institutes, in-service programs taught in the schools, etc.?

14. Did the people primarily responsible for initiating and planning the institute consult teachers and administrators in other departments and divisions of their institutions? Are any of the people so consulted now participating in any way in the institute?

15. Does the institute in any explicit way use the presence on the same campus of institutes or programs with similar aims? Does the institute in any explicit way use the normal events of the summer session -- lectures, colloquia, meetings of scholarly and professional societies, etc.?

16. Do you think the activities of the institute and its place in the community of the campus suggest that it is thought of both by those working in it and by other teachers and administrators as an exercise of responsibilities central to the host institution?

17. Did the people primarily responsible for planning the institute consult teachers, administrators, and others in the schools from which the participants in the institute were to be drawn? If they did, when and how often did they consult them? How large a part did the advice they received play in deciding the form and content of the institute? Are any of the people so consulted now participating in any way in the institute?

18. Are there any other questions which ought to be asked about the relationships between the administrators and organizers of an NDEA institute in English and other administrators and teachers?

## III Administration

19. What is the academic rank of the director? What are his usual responsibilities during the academic year? In what fields of language and literature does he usually study and teach? At what level does he usually teach? What experience has he had as an administrator? Has he taught in secondary or elementary schools? Has he taught elementary and secondary school teachers? Has he had any other experience useful to him in conducting the institute?

20. When was the director chosen to conduct the institute? Who chose him?

21. What are the duties of the director?

22. What are the regular academic ranks of those administrative assistants who hold academic appointments in colleges or schools during the academic year? In what fields of language and literature do they usually study and teach? At what level do they usually teach? Have they taught in elementary or secondary schools? Have they taught elementary and secondary school teachers? Have they had any administrative experience? Have they had other experience useful to them in helping to administer the institute?

23. Who chose the administrative assistants? When were they chosen?

24. What are the duties, apart from teaching, of each of the administrative assistants? Do any of them teach in the institute? What portion of their time is given to teaching?

25. Who decided the responsibilities each administrative assistant should be assigned?

26. Did the administrative assistants meet before the institute began? Do they regularly meet with the director, each other, or the staff during the course of the institute?

27. Did the director receive any administrative assistance during the time he planned the institute? Does he think he had enough help in planning the institute?

28. Does the director think he receives enough assistance in administering the institute?

29. Do you think the institute is effectively administered?

30. Are there any other questions which ought to be asked about the administration of an NDEA institute in English?

## IV Staff

31. What is the regular academic rank of each of the members of the staff who teach in the institute? What is the usual responsibility of each during the academic year? In what fields of language and literature does each usually study and teach? Have any of the staff taught or served as administrators in elementary or secondary schools? Have any of them taught elementary or secondary school teachers? Have any of them had other experience useful to them in teaching in the institute?

32. Who selected the members of the staff? When were they selected?

33. Did the members of the staff meet before the program began to consider its purposes and plan? How often do they meet during the course of the program, and for what purposes, with one another of with the director and his administrative assistants?

34. What do the members of the staff seem to think of one another?

35. What does the director think of the members of the staff?

36. What do the participants seem to think of the members of the staff?

37. What is your opinion of the effectiveness as a teacher of each member of the staff? How well does he know his subject? How good is he at presenting it to adults who are also teachers? Is his sense of the purposes of the entire institute clear and consistently apparent in his teaching? Is his subject and his way of presenting it appropriate to a post-baccalaureate course? Does he try to connect what he is teaching to what does or can happen when the participants in the institute return to their own classrooms?

38. Have teachers not on the staff of the institute for its full term been invited to deliver lectures, take over one of the components of the program for a short time, participate in or help to direct workshops, etc.? What are the qualifications of these guest or occasional teachers? How effective were those who were teaching in the program during your visit?

39. Are there any other questions which ought to be asked about the staff of an NDEA institute in English?

## V Participants

40. How was the institute advertised?

41. How many teachers applied for admission to the institute? Who determined the number of participants to be enrolled in the institute? Why was the size of the institute decided as it was?

42. Who selected the participants to be enrolled? By what criteria?

43. Were any invitations to enroll in the institute refused? Why were they refused? Have any participants withdrawn from the institute since it began? Why did they withdraw?

44. What does the director think of the quality and homogeneity of the group of participants enrolled in the institute?

45. What do the members of the staff think of the quality and homogeneity of the group of participants enrolled in the components of the program for which they are primarily responsible? What do the members of the staff think of the quality and homogeneity of the group of participants as a whole?

46. What do the participants seem to think of one another?

47. What do you think of the quality and homogeneity of the group of participants as a whole? What do you think of the quality and homogeneity of the groups enrolled in individual components in the program?

48. Does the director now think different criteria ought to have been used to select the participants? Do members of the staff think different criteria ought to have been used? Do you?

49. What other questions ought to be asked about the participants in an NDEA institute in English?

## VI Components of the program

50. What is the subject and nature (lecture, seminar, etc.) of each component in the program? What is the purpose of each component?

51. Who was primarily responsible for planning each component? When was each component planned? How free is the teacher to adapt or depart from the plan?

52. In what ways are the components organized so that their subjects and purposes are connected to one another? In what ways does each component make it clear how it manifests and serves the purposes of the entire program?

53. How much time each week do the participants give to each component in the program? What is a participant expected to do in a typical week?

54. Does the institute sponsor lectures, workshops, etc. which are part of its program but which are offered outside the schedules of those components offered throughout the course of the institute? How are these special and occasional events connected to those which constitute the regular curriculum of the institute?

55. In what ways are the components and the program as a whole organized and taught so that its concerns are clearly made relevant to the teaching of English in the classrooms of the participants in the institute? Are any attempts made to consider the relevance of what is being taught in the institute to the teaching of subjects other than English in elementary and secondary schools? Or to consider the relevance to the teaching of English of methods used in teaching other subjects in elementary and secondary schools?

56. Are the components or the program as a whole organized in any way so that matters can be studied and discussed which are relevant to only a part of the participants -- to junior-high school teachers, for example, who are enrolled in an institute open to both junior- and senior-high school teachers?

57. Do members of the staff visit one another's classrooms? Does the director visit their classrooms? Do members of the staff or the director participate in some formal way in workshops, seminars, or the teaching of some component in the program for which they are not primarily responsible?

58. How much time does each member of the staff spend in his own classroom and in conferring with his students individually or in small groups which he himself has convened? Do the members of the staff think they spend enough time in conferences with their students? Do you think members of the staff give enough time to conferences with their students?

59. What does the director now think of the components in the program? What does he think of the length of the program? Is it too long, or too short? Could some components have been given more time, and some less?

60. What do the members of the staff now think of the component of the program for which they are primarily responsible? What do they now think of the program as a whole?

61. What do the participants seem to think of the components of the program in which they are enrolled? Do they think the program as a whole is too long, or too short? Do they think some components in the program should have been given more time, and some less time?

62. What do you think of each component in the program? Are the subject and treatment appropriate to the participants? Are they appropriate to a post-baccalaureate course? Is the component too narrow or too diffuse in its concerns or relevance, too stringent in its advocacy of one method or kind of material, too tolerant in its survey of many methods and kinds of material? Is the program as a whole trying to do too much or too little in its term? Are individual components in the program trying to do too much or too little in the time given to them?

63. Are there any other questions which ought to be asked about the components of an NDEA institute in English?

## VII Materials and equipment

64. What new materials and equipment have been introduced into the components of the institute? How important are such materials and equipment in the component -- how central and necessary are they to the purpose and content of the course?

65. What do the participants seem to think of this new material and equipment? Do they consider it to be immediately relevant to their own teaching? Do they think its relevance to their teaching has been adequately explained and demonstrated?

66. What does the director think of the promise of the new material and equipment used in the institute? What do the members of the staff -- those who are not making use of new materials and equipment as well as those who are -- think of the promise of such materials and equipment?

67. What do you think of the ways in which new materials and equipment are used in the institute?

68. Are there any other questions which ought to be asked about the use of new materials and equipment in an NDEA institute in English?

## VIII Extra-curricular activities

69. What extra-curricular activities, in addition to lectures by teachers not teaching in the institute, occasional workshops sponsored by the institute, etc., have been planned during the course of the institute? How closely are these activities related to the topics and purposes of the institute or to the content of components in the institute?

70. Have the participants themselves organized activities -- study groups, occasional discussion groups, etc. -- outside the curriculum which extend or vary the interests of the institute's program?

71. How much time each week is simply free for the participants to pursue or discover their own ways of making use of what the institute has begun? Do the participants think they have enough free time? What do they think of the extra-curricular activities which have been planned for them?

72. How important to the purposes of the institute do the director and members of the staff think the extra-curricular activities are?

73. What do you think of the quality and usefulness of the extra-curricular activities which either the staff or the participants have introduced into the program of the institute?

74. Are there any other questions which ought to be asked about extra-curricular activities in an NDEA institute in English?

## IX Physcial facilities

75. What office facilities are provided for the director, his administrative assistants, and members of the staff? Are they adequate? Do the director, his administrative assistants, and the members of the staff consider the facilities to be adequate?

76. How many classrooms are provided for the use of the institute? Are they adequate? What do the director and the members of the staff think of the classrooms in which the institute is taught? What do the participants think of the classrooms in which they are taught?

77. How are the participants housed on campus? What are the dining arrangements for those participants who eat in the dormitories?

78. Are there any facilities in which participants who commute to the institute or who live in town with their families can meet easily and informally with participants who live on campus?

79. Does the institute use the library of the host institution in any special way (reserve shelves for the institute, lists of recommended or required supplemental reading, etc.)? Do you think the library is adequately serving the institute, or that the institute is making effective use of the library of the host institution?

80. What kinds of equipment -- audio-visual devices, mimeograph machines, typewriters, etc. -- has the institute made available to its participants and the members of its staff?

81. What is your opinion of the physical facilities of the institute? Is it conveniently housed? Are the classrooms, offices, library and dormitories close enough to one another to permit an easy traffic between them? Is the institute housed in a way which encourages the participants to think that they are part of a university campus studying matters which are properly part of a university's interest?

## X Tests

82. Were any diagnostic tests given to the participants before they began studying in the institute or during the first week of the institute? Describe these tests. What were the purposes of giving them? What do you think of their utility, validity, and difficulty?

83. What kinds of tests are given to the participants during the course of the institute, both in individual components and outside them? What do you think of the utility, validity, and difficulty of these tests?

84. Are any other tests given to all the participants in the institute, or will any other tests be given them after they have returned to their own classrooms?

## XI Follow-up

85. Does the director of the institute or any member of the staff plan to visit any of the participants in their schools during the academic year following the institute? Does the director or anyone in the department of English at the host institution plan to bring the participants back to the campus of the institution at any time during the academic year following the institute?

86. If the participants will be visited in their own schools or will return to the campus on which the institute is now being conducted, is the primary purpose of these visits to check on the efficacy of the institute, or further to instruct its participants?

# APPENDIX E

## The Use of New Materials in the Institutes

The legislation extending the National Defense Education Act to include the support of institutes to educate teachers of English specifies that their instruction will include "study in the use of new materials." Because of this stipulation, the questionnaires of the Pilot Study and the checklists of its evaluators inquired rather closely into the matter of what new materials were being used in the institutes, and how they were used. These inquiries, and those of Martha Cox and the other evaluators who visited four institutes especially to observe their use of educational media, did not discover many teachers who were using new materials other than textbooks effectively or interestingly. More often, the responses to the questionnaires and the reports of the visitors suggest that, except for new books, the faculties of the institutes do not know much about the variety and availability of new instructional media, and that they are suspicious and neglectful of the new materials they do know about.

Some of the suspicion is compounded of the instructors' uncertainty about what "new" means, and their resentment because, in the last few weeks of their institutes, a pile of questionnaires suddenly arrived in which it was strongly suggested that all along they should have been doing a great deal with films, experimental syllabi, and other new media. "New materials" apparently means both recent material, and material new to the participants. It is well simply to acknowledge but not to disturb that ambiguity. It permits some institutes to educate teachers in useful and proven texts with which they are not familiar, while other institutes may attempt genuine experiments with promising but untried material. As for the resentment, the instructors' suspicion of the motives of the Pilot Study was not wholly unfounded. The questionnaires were designed on the assumption that new materials would be extensively used in institutes. The fact that a good many of the directors and faculty of institutes bridled at this assumption says a great deal about their attitude toward new materials for the teaching of English.

For new materials were not used widely or well. The fate of the materials sent to each institute by the English Instructional Materials Center of the Modern Language Association may stand as an example. Each institute received from EIMC some material prepared in the several Project English centers. It is not easy to interpret the participants' responses to the inquiry on the questionnaire (Items 48-59) about the use of these materials, because the participants were instructed to state that the materials were not used even if they were simply not available. Still, the responses suggest that only the Oregon and Nebraska materials were used by much more than half the participants. In none of the thirteen institutes visited (including the four visited by Martha Cox and one of the evaluators in the Pilot Study) were these materials given close and consecutive study in the courses and workshops. Usually they were placed in the institute's library, there to await the whim of a curious teacher. In the words of one evaluator, "the ICM materials were wasted. Participants thought them valuable whenever asked, however, although it was often necessary to stimulate their memories to recall what the materials were....I learned of staff members who had taken the trouble to study the materials and to present them systematically. Most staff members did not have the time to do this, nor did they wish to take the trouble."

The neglect of the EIMC materials is only emblematic. Other new materials and media were used somewhat more frequently in the institutes. Many institutes, especially those which conducted courses in linguistics, used recent texts (one text used was so recent that it was still in galley sheets). Others prepared libraries and reading lists of recent college and high school textbooks in English, new syllabi and courses of study, and relevant books and off-prints on topics in English and its teaching. The most common media used in addition to books were films and overhead transparencies (see responses to Item 46 on the participant's questionnaire). A few institutes which had the equipment available used language laboratories, tape, closed circuit television, programmed instruction, and other relatively uncommon instruments. At least one institute planned that its participants prepare new materials themselves during the summer. This plan was abandoned one-third of the way through the institute's term.

But it was all characteristically peripheral, discontinuous, sometimes even grudging. The films used were uneven in quality, and often served only as an antagonist against which the instructors defined their own ideas while correcting those advanced in the films. The reserve shelves and reading lists, like those for most college courses, were fat with promises rarely exploited by instructors or participants. In workshops instructors and participants occasionally attempted to press into use some EIMC or other materials. But then the other courses would move on to a topic unconnected with the material, and the workshop would follow. When they were used, media like overhead projectors, films, and television were almost always used to instruct the participants. Rarely were the participants instructed directly in the use of these media. Books assigned as texts in the courses were taught hard and well. But again, the participants were instructed by these materials; they were not, except incidentally, instructed in their value and uses. "Rather obviously, I think," the evaluator quoted above continues, "directors and staff members of English institutes do not take seriously their responsibility to introduce teachers to new media and new materials."

One reason the faculties of institutes, which are mostly comprised of college teachers of English, do not take seriously the responsibility for instruction in new materials and media is that they do not think the materials to be very useful. Another reason is that they do not know about all the materials available. Even if the materials about which they do not know are good and bad in the same proportions as the known materials, a knowledge of them will at least increase the number of films and tapes and records they know to be useful. Finally, college teachers of English do not themselves very often use media other than books. They are, therefore, not only rarely competent to instruct other people in the uses of a variety of instructional material and means. They are also innocent of the desire of secondary school teachers especially to know about and use a variety of instructional materials. Martha Cox writes in her report: "Institute teachers, particularly those who have never taught in secondary schools or who have been away from them for a long time, may not realize how many classes secondary school teachers face daily, and just how 'daily' they occur. They need all the help they can get."

It is proper to reply that the fundamental responsibility of institutes is to teach English to teachers of English, and not to acquaint them with new or unfamiliar means of their profession. But once that priority is honored, there is no reason that the institutes cannot be used as occasions and instruments for educating teachers in the existence and uses of various instructional media, and even for creating or at least describing the kinds of new materials which are needed but are not now available. Martha Cox suggests that as a first step, the Modern Language Association and the National Council of Teachers of English cooperate to sponsor and distribute a study in which the available films, recordings, programed materials, and other media are surveyed and evaluated. Several evaluators have suggested that institutes conduct a short seminar or workshop in instructional media during which the participants are instructed in the uses of various instructional media by someone who knows about both the necessities of teaching English and the possibilities of teaching by means which supplement books. Finally, teaching in an institute is, among other things, an opportunity for college teachers of English to consider how other teachers teach. Their own ideas about the efficacy for them of films, programed texts, and other materials, and means may not be much changed if they try to comprehend the desire of elementary and secondary school teachers for help from any source which looks promising. But even to comprehend that desire will be an education for many college teachers. It will be as well a beginning toward discovering, along with elementary and secondary school teachers, which new materials and media are in fact promising, and what kinds of material -- including what kinds of books -- need to be created if the desire of teachers of English for new ways to teach their subject is to be met by means which are adequate to their subject.